The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXX, No. 5 MAY, 1949

CONTENTS

One Queen, One World . . . *Thomas Owen Martin* 369

Recent Literature on Mary's Assumption
Juniper B. Carol, O.F.M. 376

Enlisting Our Laity for Convert Work
John A. O'Brien 388

"The Glories of Mary" and Its Author
Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R. 398

Roads to Rome . . . *Walter Sullivan, C.S.P.* 407

Doorbell Apostolate . . . . . *John J. Neylon* 418

Our Lady's Queenly Prerogatives
Joseph Clifford Fenton 425

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Concerning the *Oratio imperata* 431

Judaica perfidia on Good Friday 432

Uniates or Catholics 432

Time for Singing the Introit 432

When a Host is Dropped in Distributing Holy Communion 433

Meat on Friday 434

Conditions for Plenary Indulgence 435

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00. 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1949, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

Dispensation of a Deacon 435
Reticence on Certain Doctrines 437

ANALECTA 438

BOOK REVIEWS

Churches, Their Plan and Furnishing, *by Peter F. Anson* 440
Index to Catholic Pamphlets in the English Language, *by Eugene Paul Willging* 441
Ecce Agnus Dei, *by Eric E. May, O.F.M.Cap.* 442
The Canonical Separation of Consorts, *by Eugene A. Forbes* 443
Quaestiones selectae ex hortoria primaeva, *by Fr. Cueppens* 444
The Priest and the Proletariat, *by Robert Kothen* 445
Mass Symbols, *by Joachim Watrin, O.S.B.* 446
An edition of Tertullian's *De oratione* 446
Normae Generals Junis Canonici, *by Dr. Gommarus Michiels, O.F.M.Cap.* 447

IF ALLEN SILK MILLS loomed liturgical fabrics of the same quality which certain competitors offer their customers, we would price them at the same "bargain" levels. But we shall never be lured into sacrificing Allen standards to meet a price. Our reputation and the good will of our customers are assets we deem too valuable to trifle with.

"Buy
ALLEN
SILK MILLS
ALLEN MADE MEANS AMERICAN MADE
American"

ALLEN SILK MILLS
Manufacturers
CHARLES M. MUENCH, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
868 Sixth Avenue, New York 1, N. Y.

VESTMENT FABRICS BANDINGS
DRAPERY FABRICS EMBLEMS

Sold exclusively through Church Goods Dealers

In Canada: Allen Silk Mills (Canada) Ltd., 400 Craig Street West—Montreal

ONE QUEEN, ONE WORLD

Medieval man had a penchant for the concrete, the tangible. Instead of a mere document stating that Jones had sold his farm to Smith, he wanted to see Jones hand to Smith a clod of earth taken up from the land itself. Instead of considering the Saint to whose honor his parish church was dedicated as something called abstractly a "Patron", he considered the Saint the owner of the land, at least of the bit of land on which the altar stood and to which the church and its surrounding land were "iron appurtenances."

In matters of government the medieval man did not like to think abstractly about sovereign power as something inherent in some office. Rather he preferred to consider the office as something annexed to certain lands which could be identified and which passed down from one man to another, generation after generation. Thus he could see who held the land and, through it, the power. He expressed his submission to such a man by a concrete ceremony, swearing allegiance to that man.

He preferred to think of God not so much of in His divine nature, but as the Second Person become Man, and so he thought primarily of Christ as the Lord to whom he owed submission by reason of allegiance sworn in Baptism. There was, of course, a realization that this Lord was different from his earthly lord, being spiritual, omnipotent, eternal; but for the governance of his everyday actions he thought in concrete terms of a Lord to whom his allegiance was due. He thought, too, of a Lady, the Mother of his Lord, to whom likewise his allegiance was given.

This Lord to whom he owed allegiance had laid down, he knew, certain rules for his subjects. All the liege-men of his Kingdom, having sworn their fealty to Him were to obey those rules. They were obliged to learn them and to follow them even as they were obliged to learn the rules of the lord of the manor and follow them.

The Lord, being what he was, governed the whole universe and had therefore laid down rules for the whole universe. Some of these rules might pertain to the angels and to other planets than the world, and so might be beyond the ken of mortal man; but others were definitely applicable to him and to the "nature" with which he was familiar. Observing these visible things he learned those portions of the invisible divine plan for the universe which pertained to him, just as he observed the behavior of others of his state of life and learned those portions of his earthly lord's plan for the manor which pertained to him.

He knew, too, that the Lord had not been content to leave him entirely on his own in gathering information as to the will of the Lord. Even as the heralds from the manor came from time to time to announce the will of the lord, so the Patriarchs and Prophets had come of old to announce the will of the Lord. Finally, and most importantly, the Lord Himself had come to lay down his New Law which was to be observed by all who had sworn allegiance to Him.

His Lady, too, had taken part in the announcement of the Law; for had She not kept all the words and deeds of Her Son in her heart and passed them on to the clerks who wrote them down, like Luke, even as the lady of the manor often came herself to tell him what to do, or passed on to a clerk to write down what the lord wanted? The Lady Herself had said, and so it was written, that all generations should call Her blessed, and medieval man hastened to obey.

Furthermore, the Lord had said that to Peter He would give the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven and whatsoever Peter should bind upon earth should be bound in Heaven and whatsoever Peter should loose upon earth should be loosed in Heaven. Now Peter had had his chair in the City of Rome and there had died and there another had succeeded him and still another, down through the years, even as one lord succeeded another in the manor house when death intervened. The power annexed to the place continued in Peter's successor even as it continued in the successor of the lord, and the laws he made were laws which the Lord had empowered him to make.

The herald of the Lord, Paul, had said that there was no power but from God, and that the civil ruler had a sword to punish wrong-doers. Medieval man knew well that his civil ruler had such a sword and did not hesitate to use it for that purpose; but he also considered that in using the sword rightly the earthly lord was using a power conferred upon him by the heavenly Lord who had so willed it.

To medieval minds, consequently, there was one Lord in heaven who was above all and from whom came all power in the world. From him came the power wielded by the successor of Peter in Rome as well as the power wielded by his local lord who was in turn subject to a higher noble, who was himself subject to the king, even as the king was subject to the King of Kings.

Differences there might be as to race, language, political institutions, and cultural levels, but all men who had sworn allegiance in Baptism to the Lord Jesus Christ were liege-men of the same Lord and hence bound together even as were the liege-men who had sworn with him allegiance to the same manor lord.

Medieval man might be a Frank, a Roman, a Goth, a Lombard, a Saxon, but he was sworn equally with the rest to one Lord and thus he served with them in a spirit of brotherhood, even as those who ate with him at the lord's table in the manor house were his brothers no matter whence they came, and no matter what their native dialect. Those who shared with him their Lord's Table, a consequence of their allegiance, were his brothers in arms who had put on with him the armor of the Christian.

Medieval man might live under the system of feudal lords or he might live in one of the "free cities" but that was merely a question of who held the sword entrusted to the ruler by the Lord. Over all, no matter what their form of earthly government, was the Lord who ruled the Kingdom of Heaven to whom all equally owed allegiance.

The men with whom medieval man dealt might be his equals culturally, his superiors, or his inferiors, but they were all equally liege-men of the same Lord, and with them he served as the clerk, the knight, and the herdsman served the same lord of the manor. He might feel himself their equal, their inferior, or their superior, but fundamentally they were all equal in their allegiance and they all had to cooperate in the cause of their Lord, for their own gain.

Medieval man, realizing all this, might still go forth to do battle against the liege-men of another lord, even as he might occasionally brawl with his fellow-liege-men. As feudalism split more and more with the decentralization of royal power these brawls became more and more frequent; but the participants were still capable of suspending the fight over the week-end so that all might gather at their Lord's Table.

This was a unity of the spirit, based on allegiance to one Lord in Heaven and one Lady, Queen of Heaven. It was a unity maintained and emphasized by one Lord's Table presided over by him who held the keys of the Kingdom. It was a unity based on love for the sovereign Lord of the Kingdom and a consequent love for those who were brothers in his service, no matter how much those servants might quarrel among themselves.

This unity came to be noticed the more as the unity of the Roman Empire crumbled. There had been unity when the Roman Emperors wielded their power over the then known world. It was, however, not so much a unity of brotherhood as a unity of fear.

Armies on the periphery of the Empire kept the wandering tribesmen at bay by fear of the swords in the hands of the legionnaires. Police inside the ring of steel formed by those swords kept the citizens in hand by fear of searches and seizures, denunciations and prosecutions. The world was one, but it was an uneasy unity which crumbled when the armies could no longer hold off the barbarians and the police could no longer do any more to the citizens.

Such unity appears in the world from time to time, and for the moment, perhaps, it seems to offer the answer to men's longing for tranquillity. It is, however, a unity which is costly in terms of armies and police, which taxes heavily those who see in it the answer to their prayers for peace. The armies demand more and more of men's goods for their support, and what the tax-collectors do not take the police may confiscate as the price for grumbling.

The armies are necessary to keep the outsiders at bay. The police are necessary to keep dissidence from cropping out at home. In a unity born of fear, the reasons for fear must always be kept strong. When those reasons disappear, the unity crumbles. It was in the midst of this crumbling that the Christian unity of brotherhood, which all along had been developing, came to the fore and proceeded to weld the West together once more, this time on the basis not of fear but of love.

Instead of armies sent out against the peoples migrating from the East there were bands of missionaries, teachers, who went to these newcomers unarmed to announce to them the possibility of becoming subjects of one Lord who had loved them enough to die for them and asked only their love in return, the possibility of becoming children of one Lady who desired to Mother them and care for them. Where Roman arms had failed Christian love prevailed.

The unity of the Western World, however, did not endure. The unity of the spirit which had welded men together was split. Once more men used their armies to hold their frontiers and forced those inside the ring of steel to accept the tenets of the ruler even as the Roman Emperor had charged the Christians with "atheism" and treated them as traitors when they refused to worship the gods of Rome, among whom he was the principal one. *Cujus regio, illius et religio* came to be the rule. Men no longer gathered at one Lord's Table. Men no longer rejoiced to serve one Lord and one Lady. Even when they still proclaimed allegiance to the Lord they refused to honor the Lady after His example, and they disregarded Her prophecy that all generations should call Her blessed.

National pride prevented a unification of these little states which arose out of the ruins of Western unity. Instead of an overall unity such as was seen in the days of the Roman Empire, a unity through armies and police, there arose another unity to bind together a host of principalities.

This new unity was again a unity of fear, but the fear was for a different reason. The fear this time was not of death through searches and seizures and denunciations to a magistrate who might condemn to death the hapless man brought before him, nor was it of death at the point of the sword. This unity was achieved through fear of hunger. If one did not cooperate, those who controlled the money, the resources, the opportunities of employment, would simply cut him off and he would be left to starve.

The world became one again, not through dependence upon one earthly ruler governing through his armies and his police, nor through dependence upon one heavenly Lord, but through dependence upon those who controlled the means of mortal existence. The pressure was more subtle, perhaps, but just as effective as that of arms and police. It was not a unity of brotherhood in which those who controlled were equally liege-men of a Lord above, but a unity of dependence upon those who controlled material things with no one above them to whom they must answer. Having the control of material things they seemed themselves to depend upon no one.

This unity, too, crumbled as men began to do without money and to return to a system of barter on an international scale. It crumbled as they once more proceeded to send out their armies to take the resources they needed for their subsistence. It crumbled as men began to organize and demand that they have some say in the control of opportunities for employment.

As the world wavered from one type of unity to another, and as huge empires again arose to hold the world under their sway with their armies on the periphery and their police at home, Our Lady became increasingly active, appearing more and more frequently to call men back to allegiance to Her Son, under whose rule medieval men found unity, general peace, and security. She whom men had refused to call blessed once again interested herself in their behalf, pointing out that what Her Son had said and done and what She had stored up in Her heart was their best guarantee not alone of salvation hereafter, but also of safety here on earth.

Many and varied are the solutions offered for the restoration of peace upon the earth. There are suggestions of everything from a loose confederation of all nations, to a single world government. They all ignore the possibility of a return to the rule of the Prince of Peace. Our Lady, on the other hand, calls for just such a return. Which plan is to be chosen by men?

In the loose confederation, the sovereignty of the various nations is preserved, indeed, but what is to hold the confederation together? It is but a contract, which according to prevailing theories can be broken when one of the nations decides it no longer cares to submit to its burdens. Sanctions may be applied by the other nations against the one breaking the contract, but it is not certain that they will be effective.

In the single world government, unity would be achieved at the expense of the nations' cherished sovereignty. Perhaps, in view of the insistent demands of their peoples, the nations might agree to such a world government; but it is still only a government of men by men, which in the case of the Roman Empire at length crumbled, and in the meantime kept itself in power by fear of its police.

In Our Lady's plan race, language, political institutions, cultural levels may be whatever men want them to be, for the unity is on a spiritual level where all men recognize their allegiance to one Lord and one Lady no matter what their individual differences. It is a unity of brothers-in-allegiance who partake of the Table of the same Lord, and, no matter how much they may strive with one another, are still fundamentally brothers sharing the things which their Lord provides for their daily bread.

With One Queen we might, indeed, succeed in having One World.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the leading article of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for May, 1899, Fr. H. J. Heuser, the editor, discusses the requirements for the proper construction of a baptistery, and regrets that some pastors have begun to take advantage of a license permitted only for special reasons and with the approval of the Ordinary—namely, to baptize in the sacristy of the church. He insists particularly on most scrupulous attention to the cleanliness of the baptismal water. . . . Fr. Felix, O.S.B., contributes another article to the series on American religious communities in an historical account of the Sisters of Mercy founded by Bishop John England. The author graphically describes the heroism of these devoted women during several epidemics of yellow fever. . . . Dr. Austin O'Malley continues his explanation of the precautions a priest should take to protect himself from contagious diseases in the performance of his ministry. In this article he suggests the method of disinfection to be followed in schools and homes when a child has been found afflicted with the dread disease of diphtheria. . . . In the *Analecta* there is a list of books recently placed on the Index, among which are found the dogmatic works of Dr. Herman Schell, professor at the University of Würzburg, which appeared between 1889 and 1898. . . . A response from the Congregation of the Propaganda to Bishop Emard, of Valleyfield, Canada, prescribes that those who are publicly known to be members of the "Odd Fellows" cannot be given the sacraments in the hour of death unless they make a due retractation. . . . In the Conference section a priest writing under the anonymity of "An Old Missionary" urges the clergy to take more interest in Italian immigrants. . . . Two anonymous priests object to the detailed suggestions of Dr. O'Malley concerning the care to be exercised by the priest in ministering to those afflicted with contagious diseases, and suggest, as a simpler method, the use of whiskey and tobacco.

F.J.C.

RECENT LITERATURE ON MARY'S ASSUMPTION

The approaching Marian Congress to be held here in Washington next fall under the auspices of the Franciscan Order to promote the definition of Mary's Assumption offers us a propitious opportunity to survey some of the more important contributions to this field in recent years. Even a casual glance at the bibliographical section in the various theological magazines, both national and foreign, will at once reveal an ever increasing literary production dealing with Our Lady's glorious privilege. Indeed, it would hardly be an exaggeration to state that, at least within the last two decades, no other theological subject (not even that of Mary's Coredemption) has been discussed with similar profusion.

Since it would exceed the limits of this brief resumé to give here a complete and detailed account of all the items referred to, it is our intention to pass in review only some of those which have appeared within the last three or four years, and with which our readers may perhaps be unacquainted.

Let us begin with Spain, which has produced a good deal on the subject. We may mention, for example, Fr. M. García Castro's unpretentious brochure *El dogma de la Asunción* (Madrid, 1947), which examines particularly the argument from Tradition and its theological content. The book might have passed unnoticed, had it not been for its preface, a violent attack written by Mgr. Eloino Nácar against the "exegetically preposterous"(!) idea, now so much in vogue, of basing Mary's Assumption on the Protoevangelium (*Gen.* 3, 15). He was soon answered, point by point, among others, by the well-known Spanish exegete, Fr. J. M. Bover, S.J., in *Una censura de la interpretación mariológica del Protoevangelio* (*Estudios Eclesiásticos,* XXI, 1947, 479-486).

Worthy of mention is likewise the sixth volume of *Estudios Marianos* (Organo de la Sociedad Mariológica Española, Madrid, 1947), which is wholly devoted to the Assumption. Here are some of the twenty-four contributions: E. Sauras, O.P., *Definibilidad de la Asunción* (23-42); M. Peinador, C.M.F., *La Asunción de la SS. Virgen en la S. Escritura* (51-97); F. Sola, S.J., *La Asunción de María en la tradición patrística* (119-135); E. Esteve, O.C., *La Asunción corporal y los principios de la Mariología* (223-233); A. Luis, C.SS.R., *Valoración comparativa de los argu-*

mentos con que suele probarse la Asunción (281-303); F. A. Aldama, S.J., *La Asunción ante el Magisterio Eclesiástico* (305-324); and N. García Garcés, C.M.F., president of the Society, *El movimiento asuncionista en España* (519-546). Needless to say, all these authors, along with the other contributors in the symposium, express their conviction that the doctrine is at least implicitly revealed, and that therefore, it may be solemnly defined by the Church as a dogma of divine faith.

To this we may add the recently published volume *Actas del Congreso Mariano Franciscano-Español* (Madrid, 1948), with its seventeen lengthy dissertations on the same topic, although laying particular emphasis on Mary's actual death. Among these we may indicate the following: Fr. Crisóstomo de Pamplona, O.F.M.Cap., *La muerte de la SS. Virgen a la luz de la S. Escritura, de la Tradición y de la teología* (143-166); Fr. D. Cabanelas, O.F.M., *La muerte y la Asunción de la SS. Virgen en la tradición islámica, en la ciencia y liturgia mozárabes* (209-244); Fr. B. Aperribay, O.F.M., *La muerte y la Asunción de la SS. Virgen en los representantes de la mariología franciscano-española* (263-284); and Fr. C. Balić, O.F.M., president of the Marian Commission, *Significado del actual movimiento asuncionista* (371-376). The whole volume (396 pages) may well be said to constitute a combined effort to demolish some of the views recently advanced concerning Mary's death by Fr. M. Jugie, A.A., in his *La mort et l'Assomption de la Ste. Vierge* (Città del Vaticano, 1944).

Portugal, too, has made its contribution to the movement by means of a Marian Congress held in Lisbon in October 1947 under the leadership of the Portuguese Franciscans. The papers read at the congress have recently appeared in a volume entitled: *Actas do Congresso Mariano dos Franciscanos de Portugal* (Lisboa, 1948). Among the dissertations of general interest we note: Fr. D. Sousa, O.F.M., *A Assunção na S. Escritura,* a scholarly presentation of the favorite argument taken from the Protoevangelium (5-44); F. Lopes, *A Assunção na Tradição Patristica* (45-64); and Fr. C. Balić's enthusiastic appeal *Vers un nouveau dogme marial* (165-186).

Passing over to the Italian Peninsula, we find an even greater literary production in this field. Second to none is the masterly dissertation *L'Assunzione di Maria nella Sacra Scrittura,* by Prof.

L. G. da Fonseca, S.J. (*Biblica*, 28, 1947, 321-364) ; then Fr. L. Di Fonzo, O.F.M.Conv., *De Immaculatae Deiparae Assumptione post praecipua recentiora studia critica disquisitio* (*Miscellanea Francescana*, 46, 1946, 45-104) ; Fr. O. Faller, S.J., *De priorum saeculorum silentio circa Assumptionem B. Mariae Virginis* (Romae, 1946), being a refutation of some of the statements recently made by Jugie; Fr. J. Filograssi, S.J., *De definibilitate Assumptionis Beatae Mariae Virginis* (*Gregorianum*, 29, 1948, 7-41), and G. M. Roschini, O.S.M., *Sulla definibilità dell'Assunzione* (*Marianum*, 9, 1947, 260-277). The last two articles were occasioned by the objections recently submitted by Prof. J. Coppens in his *La définibilité de l'Assomption* (*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* XXIII, 1947, 5-35), which also prompted our own rejoinder: *The Definability of Mary's Assumption* (in *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* CXVIII, 1948, 161-177).

Besides these and several other magazine articles, there is also the voluminous *Atti del Congresso Nazionale Mariano dei Frati Minori d'Italia* (Roma, 1948), containing no less than twenty-three extensive theses on Mary's death and glorious Assumption. Here, too, Fr. Jugie's well-known theories receive a thorough evaluation, followed by an emphatic rebuttal. Well deserving of mention are: A. Amore, O.F.M., *La festa della morte e dell'Assunzione della B. Vergine nella liturgia orientale* (195-222) ; Most Rev. F. Antonelli, head of the historical section of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, *La festa dell'Assunzione nella liturgia romana* (223-240) ; C. Piana, O.F.M., *La morte e l'Assunzione della B. Vergine nella letteratura medioevale,* an amazing accumulation of medieval documents, many of them utterly unknown up to the present time (281-362) ; B. Mariani, professor of exegesis at the Pontificio Ateneo Laterano, *L'Assunzione di Maria nella Sacra Scrittura,* a solid and lucid exposition, particularly of the Protoevangelium (453-510) ; and C. Balić, O.F.M., indefatigable promotor of the Assumption-movement, *Sulla definibilità dell'Assunzione della B. Vergine* (683-697).

From Italy we cross the ocean to neighboring Canada, which has also lent its enthusiastic support to the world-wide activity "pro Assumptione definienda". This is evidenced by the imposing Marian Congress held in Montreal in August, 1948, under the initiative of the Marian Committee of Canadian Franciscans[1], and under the personal and zealous leadership of Archbishop Joseph Charbonneau, of Montreal. A volume entitled *Vers le dogme de l'Assomption* (Les Editions Fides, Montreal, 1948), published immediately after the congress, now offers the world of theology the possibility of personally evaluating the various valuable contributions submitted at the Marian gathering. While not a few of these dissertations might well deserve a separate and more extensive review, the present writer has been requested to give but a brief resumé of each, adding some pertinent observations whenever advisable.

The long series of studies opens with an introductory article by Fr. Ludger Brien, S.J. (63-74), who outlines the specific task of the theologian facing the problem of the Assumption, the biblical and traditional elements to be guided by, etc.—There follows an interesting report by Fr. P. Vadeboncoeur, C.SS.R., on the manner of properly and efficiently handling the historical and theological methods in order to arrive at the conclusion that a truth is actually revealed by God (75-91).

The long disputed question concerning the mariological meaning of the 12th chapter of the Apocalypse is treated quite at length by Fr. L. Poirier, O.F.M. (93-102) who, among other things, endeavors to show the deficiency of Fr. Jugie's recent thesis, namely, that the Assumption is clearly revealed in the aforesaid text. It so happens that Fr. Jugie is not alone in this contention. Other very able scholars champion the same view, although with what degree of success, we hesitate to say. The question seems to us to be far from settled one way or another.

Fr. A. Malo, O.F.M., president of the Marian Committee for Canada, contributes a rather provocative paper on the Assumption in Sacred Scripture (103-122). The author is of the opinion that there is *no biblical passage* which may be said to contain the doctrine "either explicitly or implicitly." This statement, which not a few exegetes and theologians will consider a sweeping exaggeration, is afterwards somewhat modified in connection with the Protoevangelium. In fact, the author is willing to admit that the well-known argument of Mary's complete victory with Christ, as foreshadowed in *Gen.* 3: 15, is "unassailable" in its structure. He adds, however, that not all the elements in that argument are biblical. For example, that Mary is indissolubly associated to Christ in the latter's *threefold* victory over Satan, is not warranted by the Scriptures but by Tradition. Nevertheless, he continues, viewed in the light of the ecclesiastical magisterium and tradition, the argument has a real value and does lead us to an apodictic conclusion.

---

[1] The Committee is a branch of the International Franciscan Commission of Mariology, organized and presided over in Rome by the Very Rev. Charles Balić, O.F.M., Rector Magnificus of the Pontificio Ateneo Antoniano.

Among the speakers arrived from France to take an active part in the Congress, we must mention the well-known patrologist, Fr. F. Cayré, A.A., professor at the Catholic Institute of Paris. In his noteworthy lecture on the Assumption in the first four centuries (123-149) he shows how unfounded is the objection based on the so-called silence of primitive Christianity concerning our doctrine. This silence, he states, is only relative; indeed, it was to be expected, for the very nature of an implicitly revealed truth requires that it follow, as a normal course, a slow and almost imperceptible development. Against Fr. Malo, the author rightly contends that the Assumption is formally implicitly revealed in Sacred Scripture, namely, in *Gen.* 3: 15. As regards the early Tradition, the doctrine is implied in the constant teaching of the Fathers to the effect that Mary was *directly associated to the redemptive work of her divine Son.*

The arguments based on the Sacred Liturgy (151-202) was assigned to the learned Prof. E. Bourque, of Laval University, who with rare competence traces chronologically the various documents relating to the doctrine, bringing out the richness, antiquity and origin of their contents. In an appendix to the article, he gives us a copious liturgical florilegium of inestimable value to those who will desire to study the question in the sources themselves. No less importance attaches to the paper read by Fr. E. Longpré, O.F.M., world renowned medievalist, who likewise journeyed from Paris to attend the Congress. With the amazing erudition so characteristic of him, the speaker analyses the teaching of the Franciscan School in connection with the various elements of the doctrine (death, resurrection, bodily glorification in heaven) and shows how from the very beginning the theologians and writers of the Seraphic Order have always been in harmony with the traditional teaching of the Church in this respect. Fr. Longpré concludes, *ad mentem scholae franciscanae,* that the Assumption is a divine truth, formally implicitly revealed in the dogma of Mary's Immaculate Conception. One minor point which aroused our curiosity: Fr. Longpré states that, according to Scotus, the Blessed Virgin died, even as Christ, "in order to merit for herself *and for the Church*" (p. 208). Is this the teaching of Scotus himself or rather a conclusion of the learned author? The places referred to in the footnote have failed to answer the question for us. It is true that in the *Lectura Oxoniensis* (In III Sent., d. 3, q. 1, Ms. Balliol College 206, fol. 18^r) we read: "Creditur quod [Beata Virgo] in passione Filii sui summe meruit ex compassione."[2] A very significant text, to be sure; but not even here is it specified whether those merits were soteriological or not. Considering the recent controversies on this aspect of Mariology, the point in question is well worth clarifying. And if anyone is equipped to render that precious service to this branch of theology, it is precisely Fr. Longpré, a most competent authority on things Scotistic.

Canadian art and history, in their manifold manifestations, have likewise shown in a palpable way the profound conviction of the people concerning the doctrine of Mary's Assumption, as we gather from the well-documented dissertations of Fr. C. Morin, O.F.M., secretary of the Marian Committee (231-260), and J. Deziel, O.F.M., of the Art Institute in Montreal (261-275).

The above papers, of a more or less positive character, are followed by four others of a rather speculative nature. The first one (277-292) is from the pen of Fr. J. M. Parent, O.P., professor at the Medieval Institute in Montreal, who with great competence, calmness and accuracy analyzes the much disputed question of Our Lady's death; he brings out the weak points in Fr. Jugie's theory and concludes that the theologians of today have no cogent reason to depart from the traditional belief of the Church on Mary's death. The second is a lengthy and luminous dissertation by the distinguished French theologian, Fr. J. F. Bonnefoy, O.F.M., on Mary's Assumption considered in the light of her predestination (293-335). The lecture is, without any doubt, a most noteworthy contribution to speculative Mariology and deserves to be carefully studied and meditated upon. We shall give here but the barest outline: The author believes that the best, indeed the only, explanation of things in general must be sought in their cause; hence he adopts the method called "deductivo-a priori." First of all, then, he analyzes the order of predestinations; the absolute priority of Christ in this order; the place of Mary under Christ but *uno eodemque decreto* with Him. Christ is predestined independently from other creatures; Mary depends on Christ, but with Him she is the meritorious, exemplary and final cause of all creation. According to this hierarchy, Mary's predestination (in this order: first to glory, then to grace, and finally to the divine maternity; not inversely!) is independent from Adam's predestination and hence is not at all affected by the latter's sin.

---

[2] Cf. L. M. Bello, Min. Gen. O.F.M., *De B. Maria Virgine omnium gratiarum Mediatrice*, Romae, 1938, p. 96, n. 98.

Naturally, there arises immediately the thorny and delicate question of the *debitum peccati,* which would seem to create a grave difficulty. The author, however, hastens to show how in his theological system there is no room, there can be no room, for any *debitum* (whether proximate or remote) in our Blessed Mother. In this Fr. Bonnefoy frankly abandons the position of Scotus himself and follows that of not a few old and modern theologians. The reason for rejecting all debt of sin in the Blessed Virgin is quite simple and, it would seem, logically unassailable: If God had foreseen that Mary *should have* contracted original sin (whether proximately or remotely) and then, in point of fact, she did not contract it, we would have to say that the previous decree of God (and the debt of sin *necessarily* supposes such a decree) had been annulled by a subsequent contrary decree; which is impossible in an immutable God. In other words, we would have a positive divine decree (namely, establishing that Mary *should have* contracted original sin) which was never actually carried out.

The author then proceeds to give us a penetrating analysis of the reasons frequently advanced to justify the fact of Mary's death, and he finds them rather weak. According to him, the *traditional* and *official* reason is none other than the "conditio carnis," as we are told in the Secret Prayer of the Mass for August 15th. As regards Mary's glorious resurrection, Fr. Bonnefoy is of the opinion that the essence of this privilege does not consist, as some seem to think, in the idea of "anticipation." This *anticipation* would be, he says, an *exception* from the *common* law. But really, he continues, Mary's resurrection is an effect naturally consequent upon her sublime predestination which places her *outside* the common law, outside the divine decree relating to the transmission of sin, the death punishment, the corruption of the tomb and the retarded resurrection of all till the last day.

One observation is in order. If this new perspective developed by Fr. Bonnefoy throws so much light on the problem of Mary's death and resurrection, it seems to us that its repercussions affect likewise other Marian doctrines much debated today. Perhaps the alert reader has already speculated as to the implications concerning, for instance, Our Lady's beautiful prerogative as Co-redemptrix of mankind. When fitted in Bonnefoy's theological system, this doctrine does take on a completely new aspect which may well turn out to be of surprising value to Mariology. Indeed, the gravest difficulty advanced by some against this doctrine (namely: Mary was herself redeemed; hence she could not be a Co-redemptrix) vanishes into thin air when viewed in the light of this alluring conception. Let us hope that the distinguished theologian will continue developing his ideas along these lines; and who knows if perhaps some day he will be gratefully acclaimed as "The Scotus of Mary's Co-redemption"! Meanwhile, our readers should not formulate a definitive judgement on the merits or demerits of the system elaborated by Fr. Bonnefoy until they have read and seriously meditated upon every paragraph of this fascinating thesis.

The third article of the group is by Fr. L. M. Puech, O.F.M. (337-358), who endeavors to establish the fact of Mary's Assumption by means of the well-known Scotistic principle in favor of the Immaculate Conception, namely, Christ's perfect mediatorial activity as regards His Mother. Not being able to examine in detail the various phases of the thesis, we shall limit ourselves to one or two remarks which we deem proper.

The learned professor takes the liberty to accuse of heresy (nothing less!) all those who refuse to admit any debt of sin in our Blessed Mother. His argument? Mary has been redeemed by Christ; hence, she *should have* contracted original sin.—Frankly, the sweeping accusation seems to us a daring and offensive exaggeration. In his Encyclical *Studiorum ducem,* issued June 29, 1923, Pope Pius XI states quite unequivocally: "At ne quid eo amplius alii ab aliis exigant, quam quod ab omnibus exigit omnium magistra et mater Ecclesia." Now, the Church is well aware of the fact that there have been in the past, and there are even now, not a few theologians who reject *all* debt of sin in the Blessed Virgin.[3] Yet the Church has not condemned them. Why then should a private theologian, considering himself perhaps more orthodox than the Church, take it upon himself publicly to hurl such epithets at them?

It is true, very true, that Mary was redeemed by Christ, although *sublimiori modo,* as Pius IX declared in his Apostolic Constitution "Ineffabilis Deus." But who has ever questioned that? The authors incriminated by Fr. Puech always emphasize the fact that *every* grace which Mary received was granted to her "in view of the foreseen merits of Christ, the Savior of the human race." However, they point out that *in their theological system* Mary's "pre-redemption" does not, and *cannot,* imply any debt of sin in her. For the solution of this apparent incompatibility we refer our readers to Fr. Bonnefoy's penetrating elucidations in his *La primauté absolue et universelle de N.S. Jésus-Christ et de la Très-Sainte Vierge* (in *Bulletin de la Societé Française d'Etudes Mariales,* Vrin, Paris, 1939, p. 43-100). Curiously and significantly enough, some of the principles serving as a basis for Fr. Bonnefoy's thesis are borrowed from the Angelic Doctor himself!

---

[3] Cf., for example, Longpré's dissertation in the same volume, p. 209, n. 34; and Bonnefoy's paper, *ibid.* p. 309, n. 30; p. 310, n. 33. For a more detailed history of this question cf. C. Balič, O.F.M., *De debito peccati originalis in B. Virgine Maria,* Romae, 1941. It may be well to recall here the famous dispute which took place in Toledo (Spain) in 1616 among the leading theologians of the time concerning this very point. The Franciscans had published a brochure in which there occurred a proposition in favor of Mary's absolute immunity from the debt of sin. The matter being reported to the Inquisition by a group of Dominican theologians, the tribunal requested the Franciscans to discontinue spreading their views until further notice. In the meantime the proposition in question was carefully examined by the theological faculties of Alcalá, Seville, Córdoba, Granada, and Salamanca. Much to the surprise of the complaintants, a large number of these theologians not only did not consider the Franciscan thesis worthy of censure, but wholeheartedly endorsed it. Whereupon, after endless discussions, and having duly weighed the arguments pro and con, Cardinal Bernard de Sandoval y Rojas, head of the Supreme Tribunal of the Inquisition, issued an official decree declaring the said opinion to be quite safe and forbidding anyone to censure it as heretical. Cf. J. A. Velazquez, S.J., *Dissertationes et adnotationes de Maria immaculate concepta,* Lugduni, 1653, p. 290, adnot. 3. Velazquez reports the incident from Fr. J. Granados, the eminent Jesuit theologian, who had first-hand information on the whole affair.

Another observation on which we shall not enlarge at present: Could not Fr. Puech's own arguments in favor of the Assumption, carried to its last conclusion, be perhaps formulated thus: The most perfect Mediation of Christ towards His Blessed Mother consisted in this, namely, that He merited for her a predestination which was absolutely independent from the divine decree relating to the transmission of sin? And in this case, what has the debt of sin to do with her?

The Marian Congress could have hardly dispensed with the authoritative word of the renowned Canadian theologian, Fr. Augustus Ferland, S.S., of the University of Montreal. The distinguished author discusses with great competence the problem of the doctrine's definability (359-366), paying particular attention to such biblical texts as the Protoevangelium and *Luc.* 1: 28. He finds therein a *solid* foundation for the revealed character of the doctrine and concludes that the Supreme Pontiff may, without any further hesitation, proceed to a solemn definition.

The French section of the Congress comes to a close with a paper by Fr. V. Devy, S.M.M., entitled "Qu'est-ce que l'Assomption?" (367-378). Having first analyzed the various aspects of the question, the author passes in review the usual scriptural passages (*Gen.* 3: 15, and *Luc.* 1: 28, 42), and also the theological arguments based on the divine Maternity, perpetual virginity and Coredemption. His conclusion, which everyone will endorse, is that the most cogent argument in favor of Mary's Assumption is to be found in the constant belief of the Church as manifested in tradition, the Liturgy and the ordinary magisterium.

The English section of the Congress opens with a brief introductory lecture (381-390) by the Rev. Shaun Govenlock, of the University of Montreal, on the nature of revelation, the conditions required for the definability of a doctrine, and the various biblical arguments generally produced by our theologians to that end. While admitting the rich implicit content of the Protoevangelium and *Luc.* 1: 28, the author reveals, nevertheless, a certain preference for the much disputed passage of *Apoc.* 12: 1-18. Likewise worthy of mention is the interesting report by Prof. Clement Morin, S.S., of the theological faculty of the University of Montreal, on the Assumption in the Sacred Liturgy (301-397). The author very lucidly traces the feast back to its very beginning, first in the West, then in the East, and concludes with a chapter on the influence exercised by the Oriental development on the Latin Church.

The difficult subject of the Assumption according to the Fathers of the Church is handled with rare ability by Fr. C. F. De Vine, C.SS.R. (299-410). In the first centuries of Christianity, states the author, the Fathers did not profess an explicit belief in Mary's glorious resurrection and Assumption; yet the doctrine is implicitly contained in their unanimous teaching concerning Mary as the Second Eve, intimately associated with the New Adam in His complete triumph over sin and its consequences. Indeed, adds the author, the Fathers discovered the above doctrine in the Protoevangelium itself and hence the doctrine is revealed.[4]

Equally important is the scholarly paper on "The Assumption and Theology," read by the well-known Prof. Bernard Lonergan, of the Jesuit Seminary of Toronto (411-424). The author asks himself whether the Assumption may be defined as a dogma of divine faith and, if so, why? The answer to the former is affirmative without any doubt. The answer to the latter is: The doctrine is implicitly revealed in the perfect and singular victory won by Mary and her Son over the reign of Satan, as is gathered from the Protoevangelium, explained and understood in the light of Pauline theology concerning the resurrection. As regards the death of Our Lady, Fr. Lonergan adopts a decided stand against Fr. Jugie and believes that the latter's hesitations on the matter are devoid of solid foundation.

The last report in the volume is that of the Rev. G. Emmett Carter, of the "Jacques-Cartier" Normal School in Montreal, and deals with the precise meaning of the Assumption and its definability (425-432). In the author's opinion, which is shared by most of those who lectured at the Congress, the two most cogent arguments in favor of the doctrine's definability are these: the universal consensus of the Church for so many centuries (main argument), and the complete triumph of the Co-redemptrix with the Redeemer over the domain of sin and all its consequences.

---

[4] We are happy to recall also the remarkable dissertation of the eminent Cuban theologian, Mgr. Belarmino García Feito, *Assumpta est Maria in coelum* (La Habana, 1947), which, although having no connection with the Congress now under discussion, is conceived along the same lines as that of Fr. De Vine. Mgr. García's paper was delivered, in Spanish, at the Marian Session of the First National Eucharistic Congress in Havana, Feb. 22, 1947, and was immediately followed by the reading of a formal petition in which His Eminence, Cardinal Manuel Arteaga y Betancourt, Archbishop of Havana, voicing the sentiments of the Cuban hierarchy, clergy and faithful, urged the Supreme Pontiff solemnly to declare Mary's Assumption as a dogma of divine faith.

As anyone may easily gather from all that precedes, the Assumptionist movement has attained to gigantic proportions in recent years. Its results are most consoling indeed. The brochures and articles referred to, particularly the dissertations read at the various Marian Congresses, constitute an imposing contribution of the first order towards the long-desired definition of our heavenly Mother's singular privilege. They can hardly be neglected by our theologians.

JUNIPER B. CAROL, O.F.M.

Holy Name College
Washington, D. C.

THE MOTHERHOOD OF MARY

From this dogma of the divine maternity, as from a hidden spring of gushing water, flows the singular grace of Mary and, after God, her great dignity. Indeed, as Aquinas nobly writes, "The Blessed Virgin as Mother of God has a certain infinite dignity from the infinite Good God is." Cornelius a Lapide develops and explains this more fully: "The Blessed Virgin is Mother of God, and therefore by far excels all the angels, even the seraphim and cherubim. She is Mother of God, therefore most pure and holy, so much so that under God no greater purity can be imagined. She is Mother of God, and therefore whatever privilege has been granted any of the saints (in the line of *gratia gratum faciens*), she possesses above all."

—Pope Pius XI, in his encyclical *Lux veritatis,* issued Dec. 25, 1931.

ENLISTING OUR LAITY FOR CONVERT WORK

The convert movement in America passed a milestone in its long history in 1947 when for the first time the annual total of converts passed the hundred thousand mark and achieved the new high of 115,214. That is convincing evidence that priests and people, hitherto engrossed in the urgent task of erecting churches and schools for the millions of the faithful scattered over a vast continent, are beginning to direct more of their thought and energy toward the winning of the sheep outside the fold.

We have at last come out of the wilderness and have reached the foothills of the glorious mountain that we still must scale. It is well for us, priests and people, at this point to pause to get our bearings, take stock, sharpen our perception of our goal and chart our plans for the next stage in our campaign.

Our goal is the winning of the millions of non-Catholic people of our land; our stock is the full deposit of divine truth; our numbers 41,000 priests and 25,000,000 laity. A realistic review of the trail we have covered shows we have traveled at a snail's pace. In 1927, according to the *Catholic Directory,* there were 23,967 priests with a total of about 35,000 converts. This means that the yearly average of converts per priest was 1.5; this with the help of such laity as bothered at all about the matter.

In 1933, a total of 29,872 priests netted 40,226 converts—an average of 1.7; in 1943, a total of 36,970 received 86,905—an average of 2.3 per priest. In a decade the average had increased but .6 of 1 per cent—an acceleration that is surely nothing to get excited about. In 1947, the total of 115,214 converts received by 41,747 priests represents an average of but 2.7 per priest. At this snail-like pace, we shall never achieve the goal appointed for us by Christ—the winning of the vast numbers of non-Catholic people of our country. To accomplish that, we must raise the annual total of converts well beyond the million mark.

That this conclusion is well within the margin of the actual facts becomes further obvious when we realize that our present gains through conversions are not merely reduced but are more than nullified by a leakage, steady, stealthy and persistent, and none the less disturbing because little is said and less is done about it. Indeed when the magnitude of such losses, as shown by every house-to-house canvass ever made, is pointed out, there are those who wax wrathful and indignant and regard such statements as impugning the veracity of Christ's promise to be with His disciples all days.

Nothing is to be gained, however, by following the ostrich policy of burying our heads in the sand and ignoring unpleasant realities. We must pursue Christ's method of facing facts and coming to grips with them with intelligence and courage. We get a better perspective and a more penetrating understanding of the forces arrayed against us when we recognize that in some countries we have suffered great reverses. Thus we have seen France, the eldest daughter of the Church, fall to the condition where, according to her own prelates, not eight million Catholics can be found among her forty millions. We have observed Catholic Italy narrowly escape the establishment of a Red dictatorship—an escape effected in part by frenzied appeals from Catholic relatives in America and the inducements of untold millions of American dollars offered in the Marshall Plan.

We have seen how the vast bulk of the people in the Latin American countries have fallen away from the Church and are Catholic only in name. Indeed, in our own country there is scarcely a square block in which at least one fallen-away family or individual can't be found.

We mention these facts only in order that we might the more intelligently appraise the situation in which we find ourselves, evaluate our forces and those of the enemy, and chart an effective plan of campaign. In no spirit of pessimism do we disclose the slowness of our progress but in the spirit which prompted Foch at a critical juncture in World War I to wire General Joffre: "My right wing is dangerously threatened: my center is giving way; it is impossible for me to move; the situation is excellent; I shall attack with all force." As courage is but educated fear, so optimism is intelligent and healthy only when it faces the difficulties in a realistic manner and sets itself to find ways to surmount them.

What is the most important lesson which a study of the convert movement in America teaches? It is this: there is little likelihood that we shall ever greatly accelerate our present snail's pace until we enlist great numbers of our laity in this work. The harvest is too vast to be gathered by a small band of 41,000 priests already burdened with many pressing duties. That great white harvest can be gathered for the Master only if the 25,000,000 lay people are mobilized behind their spiritual leaders.

Generals, colonels, captains, and lieutenants would never win a battle unless they were backed up by vast numbers of private soldiers: that is the elemental fact we have somehow overlooked in our struggle to win America for Christ. The secret of the success of our missionaries in winning millions in Asia and Africa lies in their generous use of lay Catechists; a vast army of devoted lay men and women under the direction of the clergy carry on the work of the catechumenate and thus multiply the fruitfulness of a priest's efforts a hundredfold.

The enlistment, then, of the millions of our laity in the Apostolate of winning souls is the most urgent, imperative and important step to be taken in the campaign to bring the full deposit of divine truth to all the people of America.

How can we do this? How can we mobilize our masses? How can we convert them from mere passive attendants at the Sunday services to active workers for Christ? How can we shift the impossible burden from the shoulders of a few zealous priests and lay people and distribute it evenly over the shoulders of all? We can do this by weaving convert work into the life of every parish, making it an integral part of the routine work of priest and people, of sisters and pupils. *This means that we must first teach the duty of winning souls in our schools and preach it from our altars.* This obligation should be pointed out in every course in religion and it should be mentioned or clearly implied in every sermon.

Why do so few lay people interest themselves in convert work? Why are so many startled, as if they were invited to jump over the moon, when they are asked to participate? For the simple reason that the duty of engaging in such an Apostolate has never been explained to them. We need to explain that Christ was speaking to them in the person of His disciples when He said: "Go ye into the whole world, and preach the gospel to every creature."

The Grecian-Roman world was not Christianized merely by twelve Apostles, but by twelve Apostles actively assisted by *all* the followers of Christ. The marvelous propagation of the Christian faith was traceable, under the grace of God, to the unfaltering courage and tireless zeal with which the early Christians, men and women, threw themselves into the gigantic task of preaching Christ and His truths to all the peoples of the then known world. It is precisely that Apostolic zeal of the first Christians that our laity must recapture. They must become vibrant with Christ's message; they must bring it tactfully and prudently, but nevertheless courageously and tirelessly, to their fellow workers in the factory, on the farm, in the office and on the highways. They must, as the Master said in the parable of the supper, "Go out into the highways and byways and compel them to come in that my house may be filled."

They must be "instant in season and out of season," proclaiming Christ's gospel to everyone with whom they come in contact. They must outdo the communist in zeal and fervor: they must surpass the Witnesses of Jehovah in initiative and resourcefulness, and the followers of Mary Baker Eddy in their eagerness to testify for Christ; they must, in the words of St. Paul, "be all things to all men" to win souls for Christ. Only by recapturing that lost radiance of the first Christians will their faces shine with a burning zeal to bring Christ and His saving truths into the minds and hearts of their countrymen. Only by throwing themselves like their spiritual forebears, the first disciples, into the Apostolate of extending Christ's kingdom in the souls of men, shall we win America for Christ.

Since the number of bishops and priests in the infant Church was very small, it is evident that the majority of converts were won by zealous lay men and women. They were not afraid to proclaim Christ's saving truths to their pagan friends; neither were they afraid to die for Christ. Indeed the vast majority of Christians martyred for their faith were lay men and women; even in death they proclaimed Christ. Hence arose the saying current in those days: "The blood of martyrs is the seed of Christians."

The first step then in the mobilization of our laity is the arousing within them of a burning zeal for souls, a clear realization that they are called by God to extend his kingdom on earth and a willingness to labor, sacrifice and, if need be, to die to win a single soul for Christ. That means a nationwide campaign of education and preaching; for until that consuming zeal for souls takes possession of our laity and kindles them to action, the discussion of plans of action, techniques and types of organization is utterly futile. If zeal for souls be lacking, the best laid plans will crumble; if it be present, even poor techniques will yield a copious draft of souls.

"Joe," we asked at a meeting of recruiters, "will you demonstrate an effective method of approaching a non-Catholic and of inviting him to a class of instruction?"

"Father," he replied, "I'm startled at the request. I'm a salesman . . . sold insurance, refrigerators . . . now selling autos . . . have studied the technique of selling . . . but frankly I've never tried to sell a person religion. I've never even invited a non-Catholic to Mass. I always thought we were to keep out of religious discussion and leave that to the priests."

"You mean then," we observed, "that you've never lifted so much as a finger to win a soul for Christ . . . never even thought you were supposed to try."

"That's right, Father. Until you organized this group of recruiters, we never entertained the idea of 'selling' our religion to others . . . much less the notion that we had a duty to do so . . . or at least to try."

Therein is mirrored the mind of the overwhelming majority of our laity. What's the use of talking to them about techniques and organizations until we have first dispelled the false notion that they are to use their salesmanship to sell everything except Christ's saving truths? That the only proper attitude when any question rises about religion is a dumb-pan expression of utter disinterest and boredom?

Like many other converts, John Moody had to grope his way into the Church, stumbling over the boulders of the apathy of Catholic friends who should have lent him a hand instead of shrugging their shoulders and changing the topic of conversation when information was sought about the Church's doctrines. No wonder it was that some years after his conversion he declared: "In the course of time I reached the conclusion that the greatest menace to the Church today is not the opposition or antagonism of those who attack it from the outside; it is the laxity and indifference of so many of its own members."

Many years ago Archbishop James J. Keane of Dubuque told us about receiving a former Protestant minister into the fold.

"Why do Catholics," asked the convert after his reception, "make it so difficult for outsiders to find their way into the Church?

Here I am in my fifties . . . and only recently stumbled upon Cardinal Newman's *Grammar of Assent* and *Essay on the Development of Doctrine.* I have many Catholic acquaintances and friends and if any of them had loaned me such books or any other reasoned exposition of the Church's credentials, I would have been in the Church years ago . . . instead of coming in at the eleventh hour."

Then he added rather regretfully: "I never had a single Catholic say a word to me about their religion . . . the view of it from the inside, which we rarely get . . . their marvelous unity of faith . . . and the apostolicity of their doctrines. A few friendly observations would start many of us to scrutinize our own credentials; and a scholarly book, written in a friendly spirit, would dispel most of the misconceptions which really keep us out . . . not the Church's doctrines but the caricatures of them in our minds."

It is one of the strangest and most ironic facts of contemporary life, certain to mystify the historian of future ages, that the Witnesses of Jehovah, members of a religious organization with the weirdest concoction of error and falsehood, display the most aggressive zeal in winning adherents to their cult while the members of the Church founded by Christ and in possession of the fullness of divine truth for more than nineteen centuries display such singular indifference and apathy. We must struggle by might and main to replace that apathy with burning zeal: we must make clear the divinely appointed duty of all the followers of Christ to spread His Gospel of truth and mercy and love. We must hold before them the words of Christ, the Apostles, and our pontiffs explaining and inculcating that obligation.

To all His followers, Christ addressed the command: "Going therefore, teach ye all nations." Carved above the doors of the mighty Cathedral in St. Paul looking out from its eminence over the great Northwest, those words might well be placed over the portals of all our churches so that every Sunday they would echo Christ's mandate in the ears of all our laity. Shortly before His death Christ prayed for the entrance of the other sheep into His fold so that there would be but "one fold and one shepherd." He set the example for all His followers by leaving His own flock to search for the sheep that had strayed from the fold—and He searched until He found it. His ceaseless and unwearying concern was for the outsiders. Aptly did He describe His followers when He called them "fishers of men." How can a lay man claim to be a disciple of Christ when he fulfills none of these duties?

The Apostle James reflects the mind of Christ when he says: "He who causeth a sinner to be converted from the error of his way, shall save his soul from death and shall cover a multitude of sins." Hence there is a tradition dating from the first century that a person who wins a soul for Christ will himself not be lost.

Not less explicit is St. Peter in reminding the laity to participate in the work of the priesthood, saying: "But you are a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people: that you may declare his virtues, who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light . . . Having your conversation good among the Gentiles: that whereas they speak against you as evildoers, they may, by the good works, which they shall behold in you, glorify God in the day of visitation."

Stressing the duty of spreading the faith, Leo XIII called upon the laity to take upon themselves "the task of communicating to others what they themselves have received, becoming, as it were, echos of their masters [the bishops and priests] in the faith."

This was the note sounded repeatedly by Pius XI. In *Mens Nostra,* the great encyclical of the retreat movements, he declares: "From this perfection of Christian life which is manifestly obtained from retreats, besides that inward peace of soul, there springs forth spontaneously another most choice fruit which redounds to the great advantage of social life, namely, that desire of gaining souls to Christ which is known as the apostolic spirit. For it is the effect of charity that the just soul in whom God dwells by grace, burns in a wondrous way to call others to share in the knowledge and love of that infinite good which he has attained and possesses." In *Rerum ecclesiae* the same pontiff says that "the Church has no other reason for existence than, by enlarging the Kingdom of Christ throughout the world, to make all men participate in His salutary redemption."

One of the favorite themes of this zealous pontiff was Catholic Action: the participation of the laity in the Apostolate of the hierarchy. "Catholic Action," explains His Holiness, "has for its object both the Christian perfection of its members and the Christian Apostolate toward those on the outside." Hence it is sadly incomplete if it does not concern itself with winning souls for Christ.

Many Catholics seem unaware of this duty and rarely lift a finger to bring the truths of Christ to those outside the fold. Pius XI strove repeatedly to stir the faithful with a zeal for winning souls. Writing to the Cardinal Patriarch of Lisbon, His Holiness declares: "It will be useful to make Catholics understand fully, since many of the faithful are yet unaware of it, that the Apostolate is one of the duties inherent in the Christian life. It is the sacraments of baptism and confirmation which impose among other obligations that of the Apostolate, that is, the duty of spiritual help to our neighbors."

Pius XII likewise emphasizes the duty of the laity as members of the Mystical Body to share with the religious in the precious work of winning converts and thus incorporating them in the Mystical Body. "Not only those who have consecrated themselves to God in religious life," declares the pontiff, "but members of the Mystical Body of Christ as well have the obligation of working hard and constantly for the upbuilding and increase of this Mystical Body of Christ."

His Holiness practiced what he preached. In a letter commemorating the fourth centenary of the Council of Trent, he issued a direct appeal to non-Catholics, especially "those who retain at least their faith in the principal divinely revealed truths" to return to their fathers' house—the Church founded directly by Jesus Christ.

The mind of the Church is mirrored in the Code of Canon Law, the official law of the Church, which decrees: "Ordinaries of dioceses and pastors shall regard non-Catholics residing in their dioceses and parishes as commended to their care in the Lord" (Can. 1350). Thus is manifested the Church's solicitude for our separated brethren whom priest and lay people are in duty bound to assist in their groping for the fullness of divine truth.

This duty is thus explicitly stated by Archbishop Cushing in an address to Theta Phi Alpha, a lay organization: "If we sincerely believe that the Catholic Church is the true Church, then it is our clear duty to try by every reasonable means to make that faith known and to lead everyone into its fold." Such are the words which should be addressed to every organization of Catholic men or women, large or small, at every meeting. In that way we would soon replace the present attitude of passive indifference with one of active interest and aggressive zeal.

We have cited the command of Christ, the teaching of the

Apostles and the pronouncements of our pontiffs and bishops to show that the winning of converts is a duty incumbent upon all the followers of Christ, upon the laity as well as upon the religious. The extension of Christ's kingdom is directly dependent upon the zeal and co-operation of our laity and they are in consequence under a divine obligation to strive by might and main to assist in the work of the Incarnation and of the Redemption. It is an obligation from which no human power can dispense them.

Now a word concerning the theological basis of this form of the Apostolate. This duty, as Pius XI pointed out, follows as a corollary from the reception of baptism and confirmation. By baptism we become children of God and members of His Church which is the Mystical Body of Christ. As members of that Body, we are nourished with divine life and are in duty bound to share it with others who possess it but sparingly or not at all. Thus do we assist Christ in the fulfillment of His earthly mission: "I am come that they may have life and may have it more abundantly."

Confirmation is the sacrament of spiritual maturity, the sacrament by which one receives the powers of Christian adulthood and is enabled to fight not as a mere infant but as a full-grown soldier in the army of Christ. "In this sacrament," points out St. Thomas Aquinas, "the fullness of the Holy Ghost is given, which is the spiritual grace which belongs to full-grown manhood." Hence it imposes upon the recipient the power and the duty of championing the cause of Christ and of seeking to extend His reign in the hearts and souls of men. While infants are privileged to crawl, adults are expected to stand up and fight like men. So all recipients of confirmation are expected by their leader, Jesus Christ, to fight manfully, courageously and persistently to win every soul for whom their Master shed His blood on Calvary's Cross.

How then can we make clear to our laity the divine obligation of winning souls for Christ? First, by preaching it from the pulpit in season and out of season. Rarely, if ever, have our congregations heard a sermon on this subject. Somewhere along the line, perhaps in the midst of our engrossing work of building churches, schools, and convents for our flocks swollen by mighty streams of immigration from Europe, we have allowed the consciousness of this obligation to become blurred, if not completely obscured. We must make up for lost time; we must preach it often and refer to it repeatedly. Preceding the announcement of the establishment of a course of instruction for inquirers, we must devote an entire sermon at all the Masses to this serious duty of our laity on at least one Sunday and refer to it on the other Sundays.

Secondly, our schools must inculcate this duty in the minds of our children. They must be trained from childhood to regard the winning of a soul as one of the most important duties resting upon every soldier of Christ. Hitler was able to inoculate the youth of Germany with the doctrines of the Nazis and build them into regiments of power to support his tyranny. We must lodge in the minds of our youth the beautiful teachings of Christ concerning the dignity, the sanctity and the infinite worth of the human soul and the supreme duty of winning souls for the divine Master.

By sermons, class-room instruction, pamphlets, books, and example we must drive home to our 25,000,000 Catholics their divine and inescapable duty of co-operating with Christ in the fulfillment of the work of the Redemption through the Apostolate of Catholic Action. When we accomplish that, we shall have taken the first and the most important step in the winning of the non-Catholic people in our land for Christ. We shall have plugged the greatest loss which the Church in America has been suffering for generations—the loss of the potential zeal and missionary activity of the millions of our laity. We have as loyal and devoted a laity as is to be found in all Christendom. With those vast millions mobilized solidly behind their spiritual leaders in the systematic and well-organized effort to bring the fullness of Christ's truths to the churchless people of our land, the annual number of converts will rapidly climb past the million mark and the winning of our beloved country for Christ will be not merely a glorious dream but a solid and enduring reality.

JOHN A. O'BRIEN

The University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Ind.

MISSION INTENTION

"Vocations of Young Women for the Missions" is the Mission Intention for the month of May, 1949.

"THE GLORIES OF MARY" AND ITS AUTHOR

Almost two hundred years ago a work of Marian theology and devotion in the Italian language was published in Naples, bearing the title *Le glorie di Maria.* Its author was a devout and zealous priest, the Superior General of a small missionary society which had been establishd in 1732 and had received the approbation of the Holy See in 1749 as the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. At the time of the publication of *The Glories of Mary* the author was fifty-four years old, and had as yet acquired very little fame as a writer. His only previous work of any noteworthy scholarship was a manual of moral theology, which had appeared in a single volume in 1748, and was actually the *Medulla theologiae moralis* of the Jesuit, Fr. Herman Busembaum, augmented by annotations and several appendices. The author in question was Alphonsus Maria de Liguori, at that time little known outside the Kingdom of Naples, but destined later to be known and respected as an eminent scholar throughout Europe even in his lifetime, and to be declared a Saint and a Doctor of the Church within a century after his death.

Certain events that immediately preceded the publication of *The Glories of Mary* are very interesting, for they center about one of the most learned men of the times, whose scholarly labors in the Catholic cause have won him a high place of honor, but who showed himself out of harmony with the devotional spirit of his native land and with the more common trend of Catholic tradition in the field of Mariology. This man was Louis Muratori, celebrated savant of Modena, whose name has been perpetuated through the important "Muratorian fragment" which he published for the first time and to which he gave the title "Fragmentum acephalum Caji, ut videtur, Romani presbyteri." [1]

Muratori had encountered many violent charges against his orthodoxy in consequence of a work which he published in 1714, entitled *De ingeniorum moderatione in religionis negotio,* under the pseudonym of Lamindus Pritianus. This work was intended as a refutation of the Calvinist Jean le Clerc, who had endeavored to find a defence of his religious principles in the writings of St. Augustine. While refuting the doctrines of Calvinism, Muratori essayed to explain the distinction between those doctrines which a Catholic is obliged to hold, and theological opinions which he is free to reject. To many Catholics Muratori seemed unduly "liberal," and in the course of the next few years a considerable number of writings were published by various authors objecting to his views. Yet, Muratori continued to defend his opinions, and, on the whole, he acquitted himself very creditably.[2]

---

[1] Cf. Amann, "Muratori," *Dictionnaire de theologie catholique,* X, col. 2549.

In 1747 Muratori, then in his seventy-sixth year, published another work under the same pseudonym of Lamindus Pritianus, entitled *Della regolata divozione dei cristiani.* In this he condemned as superstitious certain forms of devotion which were then in vogue among Catholics, particularly in Italy. Some of these devotional practices were such that one could impugn them without setting himself at variance with Catholic tradition. Such was the custom of taking an oath to defend, even to the shedding of one's blood, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception—a doctrine as yet not defined by the Church. Muratori was a vigorous opponent to this "sanguinary oath." [3] However, in one of his statements he put himself at variance with a doctrine which, though not an article of Catholic faith, had many testimonies of Catholic tradition in its support—the doctrine of Mary's universal mediatorship in the economy of human salvation. Muratori denied to Our Lady the title of Mediatress of all graces, save in a very remote and broad sense. He said:

> In a similar fashion we can meet the assertion that no grace, no benefit comes to us from God save through the hands of Mary. What is reasonably meant is that we have received by means of this Immaculate Virgin our Lord Jesus Christ, through whose infinite merits descend on us all gifts and every heavenly blessing. It would be an error to believe in any other sense that God and His blessed Son would not grant us, or could not grant us graces without the mediation and intercession of Mary.[4]

In justice to Muratori it must be stated that his writings, after being submitted to the Holy Office, were declared free from censure. Subsequently Muratori heard that Pope Benedict XIV, in a letter to the Inquisitor General of Spain, had declared that some things in the venerable scholar's writings were actually worthy of condemnation, but that he had been spared in consideration of his age and his many labors for the Church. At once Muratori wrote to the Pope, declaring himself ready to retract any errors in his books that might be pointed out. In reply the Sovereign Pontiff wrote him an affectionate and conciliatory letter, explaining in a very diplomatic way the rather severe statements he had made in his letter to the Inquisitor General.[5]

---

[2] *Ibid.*, col. 2552.

[3] *Ibid.*, col. 2554.

[4] *Della regolata divozione dei cristiani* (Venice, 1747), c. 22.

However, this did not prove that Muratori had always proposed doctrines fully conformable with the best Catholic traditions, and, in particular, the matter of Mary's universal mediatorship. It was on this point that Alphonsus de Liguori took issue with the scholar of Modena. However, the refutation of Muratori was not the entire theme of *The Glories of Mary,* as it was that of a work published by Fr. B. Plazza, S.J., in 1751.[6] For more than fifteen years Alphonsus had been collecting material for a work on the Blessed Virgin.[7] But the appearance of Muratori's work inspired him to expedite the publication of the volumes he was planning, and to devote a chapter to the refutation of what he regarded as an error in the *Della regolata divozione.* And so, in the fall of 1750 *The Glories of Mary* was published in two volumes. It is interesting to note that in the preface Alphonsus asserted that he was anxious to have the work printed before his death, which he anticipated as fast approaching because of his advanced age and ill health.[8] Evidently it would have given him considerable surprise if he had even suspected that thirty-seven years of life still remained to him, in which he would publish more than 100 theological and devotional works that would bring immeasurable benefits to souls and would merit for himself the dignity of *Doctor Ecclesiae.*

The first part of *The Glories of Mary* is made up of ten chapters, and is an explanation of the different clauses of the *Salve Regina.* The second part is a compilation of a number of discourses for the feasts of Our Lady, treatises on her virtues and sufferings, and an explanation of devotions in her honor, such as the rosary and the scapular. Additions were made in later editions. Thus, in 1755 a defence of Muratori was published by his nephew, Don Soli, under the title *Lamindi Pritiani redivivi epistola paraenetica.* Muratori himself had died in the early part of 1750.[9] In the second edition of *The Glories of Mary,* which left the press in 1756, Alphonsus replied to Soli, and this response now forms a part of the work. In 1775 Alphonsus, then in his eighty-fifth year, wrote a defence of his doctrine in reply to the Abbate Rolli, who had renewed Muratori's attacks on certain devotions to Our Lady, and this defence also has been incorporated into *The Glories of Mary.* Toward the end of this latter reply Alphonsus showed that, although he objected to Muratori's views on devotion to the Blessed Virgin and on the place she holds in the plan of redemption, he was quite willing to accord to his opponent the honor due to his scholarship and lofty motives. Alphonsus wrote:

---

[5] *DTC,* X, col. 2555.

[6] Plazza, *Christianorum in sanctos sanctorumque reginam . . . communis et propensa devotio* (Palermo, 1751).

[7] Cf. Dillenschneider, *La mariologie de S. Alphonse* (Friburg, Switzerland, 1931), 256.

[8] Cf. *Opere ascetiche di S. Alfonso,* VI (Rome, 1935), 10.

> Louis Muratori, whom I have always venerated, was celebrated throughout Europe, as is evident from the beautiful biography written by his nephew; but, as I have already noted, in many parts of his writings he did not show that piety toward the Mother of God which would have been suitable to a soul such as his.[10]

Up to the year 1933 *The Glories of Mary* had been published in 736 editions in many different languages, including Turkish, Arabic and Japanese.[11] More than twenty different editions have been published in English, the first of which appeared in Dublin in 1833. The first American edition dates from 1839 (the year in which Alphonsus was canonized), the place of publication being Philadelphia.[12] *The Glories of Mary* has been the subject of many attacks from non-Catholics, among whom was the celebrated Anglican, Dr. Pusey. The essential point of these attacks was, of course, the charge of "Mariolatry," the claim that Catholics ascribe to Mary a power and dignity that should be reserved for God alone.

---

[9] According to *DTC,* X, 2548, Muratori died in 1751, but the other sources consulted place his death in 1750.

[10] *Opere ascetiche di S. Alfonso,* VII (Rome, 1937), 501.

[11] Cf. Meulemeester, *Bibliographie générale des écrivains Rédemptoristes* (Louvain, 1933), I, 334 ff.

[12] *Ibid.,* 223.

In general, the first part of *The Glories of Mary* is theological, the second part devotional, though the division is by no means clear-cut. Each of the ten chapters of the first part follows the same pattern. A portion of the *Salve Regina* is explained, and its theological implications are pointed out and demonstrated. Then follows an anecdote calculated to illustrate the particular doctrine that has been developed, and an appropriate prayer to the Blessed Virgin. Several of the chapters are divided into two or more sections, each of which is developed according to the plan just described.

To support his teachings Alphonsus relies mainly on the tradition of the Church as it is manifested in the writings of the Fathers, saints and theologians. Thousands of quotations are interspersed through *The Glories of Mary,* demonstrating the extensive research of the author in preparing this work. As would be expected, in view of the great number of these references and, in some instances at least, the lack of critical sources, there are some mistakes. In the recent critical edition of the ascetical writings of Alphonsus every quotation has been checked, and, when necessary, a correction is made in a footnote. Thus, in the second chapter we find a statement ascribed by Alphonsus to St. Laurence Justinian, which in reality was made by Richard of St. Laurence.[13] In the seventh chapter a quotation is attributed to the Abbot Rupert, the author of which was the Abbot Guerric.[14] Some of the sayings credited to St. Bernard are actually taken from the works of other less renowned authors.[15] But such mistakes are comparatively few. In his scholarly work *La Mariologie de S. Alphonse,* Fr. C. Dillenschneider, C.SS.R., makes this comment:

> We do not claim that St. Alphonsus was an expert in the critical study of ancient documents. In this sphere we believe him inferior to Fr. Plazza. The apocryphal texts which Doellinger accuses him of using are actually such, though they are relatively few among the immense number of citations contained in *The Glories of Mary.* One will find an exact list in the appendix which Fr. Litz, C.SS.R., has added to the most recent German edition of the Alphonsian Mariology. As far as the present question is concerned, the passages of the Fathers which have been demonstrated to be spurious are not devoid of value, for

---

[13] *Opere ascetiche,* VI, 89.

[14] *Ibid.,* 251.

[15] *Ibid.,* 80.

they prove the existence of a belief in the universal mediation of Mary in the distant epoch when they were composed.[16]

It is in the fifth chapter of *The Glories of Mary* that Alphonsus developed the doctrine which he regarded as the keystone of his work—the doctrine that all graces granted to men pass through the hands of Mary in the sense that they depend in some measure on her intercessory power:

> The point which we intend to prove is that the intercession of Mary is also necessary for our salvation—necessary, not absolutely, but morally, to speak correctly. And we say that this necessity arises from the very will of God, who wishes that all the graces which he dispenses to us shall pass through the hands of Mary.[17]

To the objection based on the words of St. Paul, that Jesus Christ alone is our Mediator,[18] Alphonsus makes a distinction between mediation of justice by way of merit and mediation of grace by way of prayer, attributing the former to Christ and the latter to Mary. To prove that Mary's mediation is universal and necessary he invokes particularly the authority of St. Bernard, St. Bonaventure and St. Bernardine of Siena. In reply to an objection brought up by Muratori, that this doctrine would render the practice of praying to the other saints useless, Alphonsus answers that there is nothing incongruous in believing that the other saints in heaven present their prayers to God through Mary.[19]

In the course of the two centuries that have passed since *The Glories of Mary* first appeared the doctrine that Mary is the mediatress of all graces has been confirmed by a considerable number of papal pronouncements. Pope Leo XIII asserted: "It can be truly and properly asserted that nothing of that great treasury of all grace which Our Lord acquired—since grace and truth came through Jesus Christ—nothing is granted to us, God so willing, save through Mary." [20] Pope Pius X called Our Lady "the dispenser of all the gifts which Jesus acquired for us by His death and blood." [21] Pope Benedict XV approved a feast in honor of

---

[16] Dillenschneider, *op. cit.*, 312.

[17] *Opere ascetiche*, VI, 159.

[18] *I Tim.*, 2:3.

[19] *Opere ascetiche*, VI, 160-82.

[20] *Acta Leonis XIII*, Vol. XI (Rome, 1892), 303.

[21] Encycl. *Ad diem illum*, Feb. 2, 1904, *Acta Pii X*, Vol. I (Rome, 1905), 153.

Our Lady as the Mediatress of all graces, and granted a generous permission for its observance in dioceses and religious institutes.[22] Pope Pius XI spoke of Mary as "the advocate before God of all graces." [23] In consequence of such unequivocal statements there is agreement among theologians that the doctrine of Mary's universal mediatorship is a certain doctrine, and there are some even who believe that it could be defined as an article of faith.[24]

Alphonsus was particularly interested in establishing the proposition that the intercession of the Blessed Virgin is necessary for the *distribution* of all graces, and it is this proposition that seems clearly established by papal pronouncements and theological consent. But there is much discussion as to Mary's part in the objective redemption—the *acquisition* of graces. Can she be called in a true sense the Co-redemptress? The state of the question has been thus proposed recently by Canon George Smith:

> With regard to Mary's remote co-operation in the objective redemption there has never been any serious difference of opinion among theologians: by her free consent to the divine motherhood she co-operated proximately in the Incarnation and therefore remotely in the Redemption of which it was a necessary pre-requisite. . . . No one doubts, either, that Mary's initial obedience continued in a persevering acquiescence in the divine will that her Divine Son should redeem mankind by His passion and death. . . . It is one thing, however, to say that Our Lady was united with Christ in obedience to the divine will, and to see in that perfect communion between Mother and Son the measure of her merit for us. But it is an entirely different thing to say that Mary's acquiescence in the divine decree exerted any moral influence on Christ Himself; that she "moved" or "induced" Him to redeem us.[25]

Did St. Alphonsus hold that Mary participated immediately in the objective redemption? Did he teach that she took an active and (by God's decree) necessary part in the acquisition of the graces which her Son merited for mankind? Some have believed that the Saint denied Mary's co-operation in our redemption to this extent, and in proof have adduced statements from his writings, such as the comparison between mediation through justice and mediation through impetration (given above).[26] But there are other passages in which the Saint seems to imply that Our Lady concurred immediately in the work of the redemption, especially the argument which he used in his reply to Don Soli, and which he regarded as the strongest argument for her mediatorship of dispensation: "Since, as St. Augustine says, Mary co-operated toward the spiritual birth of the faithful, God also wishes that she co-operate by her intercession that they may obtain the life of grace on earth and the life of glory in heaven." [27] This argument would have no force if the Saint did not admit some participation on the part of Mary in the objective redemption. However, one might still discuss the particular mode of co-operation to which Alphonsus was referring. A very reasonable opinion is that proposed by Fr. J. B. Carol, O.F.M., who concludes from various statements of the Saint that it is probable that he held, at least in substance, the present-day doctrine of Mary as Co-Redemptress.[28]

---

[22] *AAS,* XIII (1921), 345.

[23] *AAS,* XVIII (1926), 213.

[24] Cf. Bittremieux, *De mediatione universali B. M. Virginis quoad gratias* (Bruges, 1926).

[25] *Clergy Review,* XXXI, 2 (Feb., 1949), 110.

The Glories of Mary, though it was written 200 years ago, still remains a classic of Catholic theological and devotional literature. The learned as well as the simple can find in it instruction and inspiration, for its content represents the sound testimony of Catholic tradition on the dignity and power of the Mother of God, presented in a clear and popular manner. The fact that this book still appeals to a wide range of readers is an indication that the true spirit of Catholic devotion to Mary remains vigorous in the hearts of the faithful.

If we accept the authenticity of the revelations of Fatima, the human race must have recourse to Mary, as well as to her Son, if peace and happiness are to be restored to the world. And no better guide toward the cultivation of a true devotion to the Mother of God could be found than *The Glories of Mary,* whose learned and holy author desired it to be a means of bringing all who read it to a more ardent love of his Heavenly Queen, for he wrote in the Introduction:

---

[26] E. G. Goosens, *De cooperatione immediata Matris Redemptoris ad redemptionem objectivam* (Paris, 1939), 132.

[27] *Opere ascetiche,* VI, 193.

[28] Carol, J. B., O.F.M., *Testimonia saeculi xviii de Beata Virgine Coredemptrice* (Marianum, Rome), 22.

Thou must know, O Lady, that I expect a reward for my little offering; and that is, that from this day forward I may love thee more than ever, and that every one into whose hands this work may fall may at once be inflamed wtih love of thee, and that his desire of loving thee and of seeing thee loved by others may be increased, so that he may labor with all affection to preach and to promote, as far as he can, thy praises, and confidence in thy most powerful intercession.[29]

Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

---

[29] *Opere ascetiche,* VI, 10.

The Perfection of the Church

God indeed even made the Church a society far more perfect than any other. For the end for which the Church exists is as much higher than the end of other societies as divine grace is above nature, as immortal blessings are above the transitory things on the earth. Therefore the Church is a society divine in its origin, supernatural in its end and in the means proximately adapted to the attainment of that end; but it is a human community inasmuch as it is composed of men. For this reason we find it called in holy writ by names indicating a perfect society. It is spoken of as the house of God, the city placed upon the mountain to which all nations must come. But it is also the fold presided over by one Shepherd, and into which all Christ's sheep must betake themselves. It is called also the kingdom which God has raised up and which will stand forever. Finally, it is the body of Christ—that is, of course, His mystical body, but a body living and duly organized and composed of many members; members indeed which have not all the same functions, but which, united one to the other, are kept bound together by the guidance and authority of the Head.

—Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical *Satis cognitum,* issued June 20, 1896.

ROADS TO ROME

G. K. Chesterton has somewhere remarked that one way of getting home is to walk all the way around the world until one arrives there. This is a survey of the journeys of two men which finally led them to a common home: the Catholic Church. If these men didn't travel around the world, they surely came a great ways. For over a quarter of a century (1816-1843) John Henry Newman retained the notion that the Pope was the Antichrist.[1] Orestes A. Brownson came even a greater distance because he had to travel not only from religious scepticism[2] but even from atheism,[3] which he entertained at least briefly. Newman died a Cardinal of the Holy Roman Catholic Church and Brownson became one of its most enthusiastic and articulate defenders in America.

Although they lived contemporaneously, geography separated them by an ocean, and temperament, culture, and background kept them far apart. Newman was gentle, shy, sensitive, refined, Oxford educated. Someone called him, "A little old lady washed in milk," but when provoked, he was a skilled and resourceful controversalist, he broke clean, but he struck hard, and he left his antagonist in ribbons. Brownson was a plain blunt man; largely self-educated, a huge man, a Yankee who did not wait on ceremony, who could thump a table and raise his voice. If he was not skilled in the use of the verbal rapier he was clever enough with the weighty club of his logic, and raised lumps on many heads, not excluding Newman's.

Both men were conscious of each other, but their mutual influence was not great. Early in 1845 Newman started to write his *Essay* on doctrinal development,[4] and before he reached its completion, he resolved to become a Catholic. Accordingly, he was baptized by Fr. Dominic Barberi, Oct. 9, 1845 at the age of forty-four.[5] (This was three days after Renan had broken with Catholicism). Brownson, at the age of forty-one, had been received into the Church the previous year, Oct. 20, 1844, by Coadjutor

---

[1] Cf. *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (Everyman's Library edition), p. 33.

[2] Cf. Henry F. Brownson, *Orestes A. Brownson's Early Life,* p. 22.

[3] Cf. *Works of Orestes A. Brownson,* collected and arranged by Henry F. Brownson, XX, 429.

[4] Cf. *Apologia,* p. 208.

[5] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 212.

Bishop John B. Fitzpatrick of Boston. Although Brownson entered the Church before Newman, and independently of him, he claimed that his own entrance into Catholicism was delayed because he had held Newman's development theory, and was kept out of the Church by it.[6]

Newman once said that if he had been converted in the wrong manner there was no remedy for that, and it certainly appears that Brownson thought Newman had been converted in the wrong manner and frequently wrote in criticism of Newman's position.[7]

Wilfrid Ward in his *Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, states that after Newman had been attacked by Brownson, he received a letter of encouragement from the Cardinal, to which Newman replied, "I have not allowed Dr. Brownson's rudeness to annoy me, yet it is a great satisfaction and comfort to receive such assurances as you have written me." Still, when Newman was selecting a faculty for the new Dublin University he proposed Orestes Brownson for a professorship. And Brownson was later to admit that he had been too severe in his censure of Newman, when the American edition of the *Essay on Development* had appeared in 1847.[8]

Each made the journey independently of the other; but each made it for the same reason. Newman in the *Apologia* said, "I have no misgivings at all that they [my readers] will be ungenerous or harsh with a man who has . . . given up much that he loved and prized and could have retained, but that he loved honesty better than name, and truth better than dear friends."[9] In a similar vein Brownson said, "From our youth up we have loved truth, and wooed her as a bride, and we wish to die in her embrace. We have never adhered from pride or obstinacy in any opinion that we had once entertained, and have always been ready—some would say too ready—to abandon any opinion once held the moment we were satisfied to its unsoundness."[10] But even more interesting than the reason that prompted their ultimate acceptance of the Catholic Church, is the development of their religious views, and in the case of both men, they have presented rather full indications of their mental and spiritual progress. Newman in the *Apologia* and Brownson in *The Convert.*

---

[6] Cf. *Works*, XIV, 13.

[7] Cf. John Moody, *John Henry Newman* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1945), p. 180.

[8] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 186 f.

[9] *Apologia*, p. 14.

[10] *Works*, XX, 380.

Orestes Brownson was born in Stockbridge, Windsor County, Vermont, Sept. 16, 1803. He was entrusted, at the age of six, to an aged couple of Royalton, who taught him the shorter catechism, the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer, but did not enroll him in any definite religion. His reading was largely in the Scriptures, which he read at eight and knew practically by heart at fourteen. However, his mind had been unsettled on the most important points of Christian faith by reading works by "Liberal" Christians, especially Universalists. It was to quiet his doubts that at the age of nineteen he joined the Presbyterian Church at Ballston, Saratoga County, New York. He remained in the Presbyterian Church for about two years. He left it because he decided, "If Our Lord founded a church and has a church on earth, it must reach back to His time, and come down in unbroken succession from the Apostles. But the Presbyterian Church is a recently formed body, not three hundred years old." Furthermore he was convinced that "In becoming a Presbyterian on the ground I did I placed myself in a false position—feeling the insufficiency of my own reason to guide me, I turned my back on reason, and took up with what I supposed to be authority without a rational motive for believing it divinely commissioned." Also, there were some specific teachings that he found particularly repugnant to him. He had no sympathy for "the fundamental doctrine of Calvinism that man by his fall lost his natural spiritual faculties and became totally depraved, incapable by nature of anything but sin." And in like manner he said, "The doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation, and that doctrine that God foreordains the wicked to sin necessarily, that he may damn them justly, I found difficult to swallow, and still more difficult to digest."

Brownson, like Newman, had a keen awareness not only of intellectual problems but of man's inner tensions as well. It was this awareness that led him to accept Universalism—the doctrine of universal salvation, after his rejection of Presbyterianism at the age of twenty-one.

> Our natural light, even the best we have is dim, our natural reason is weak, and to err is human. . . . Nor is this the worst. We are not only weak to know, but we are even weaker to perform. None of us do

> as well as we know. The spirit is willing but the flesh is weak. I see the right, I approve it, and yet pursue the wrong. My will is weak, and my appetites and passions are strong. I am surrounded with temptations to which my firmest resolves succumb. I feel the want of moral power that I find not. Now it cannot be that a just and good God has left me in so much darkness, so frail and so morally weak in myself, and yet attached the penalty of eternal death even to my slightest transgressions. These were reasons sufficient, I thought for rejecting endless punishment.

In that passage Brownson suggests the famous passage from Newman's *Apologia.*

> Starting then with the being of God . . . I look out of myself into the world of men, and there I see a sight which fills me with unspeakable distress. . . . To consider the world in its length and breadth, its various history, the many races of man, their starts, their fortunes . . . the greatness and littleness of man, his far-reaching aims, his short duration . . . the disappointments of life, the defeat of good, the success of evil, physical pain, mental anguish, the prevalence and intensity of sin . . . all this is a vision to dizzy and appal. . . . And so I argue about the world . . . *since* there is a God, the human race is implicated in some terrible ab-original calamity . . . and thus the doctrine of what is theologically called original sin becomes to me almost as certain as that the world exists, and as the existence of God.

At the time when Brownson was confronted with the problem of the goodness of God and the existence of hell, he was a young man of twenty-one. He was satisfied that the very idea of hell was contrary to reason, and he became a Universalist. In the summer of 1826 he was ordained an evangelist by a Universalist association, which met that year at Joffrey, New Hampshire. When he found that he could not sustain his doctrine of universal salvation from Holy Scripture, he rejected the Bible. Under the influence of the writings of Hosea Ballou he began to abandon belief even in those few doctrines which as a Liberal Christian minister he was obliged to preach, and so he broke his connection with the Universalists. He described his situation thus:

> I had, following reason, lost the Bible, lost my Saviour, lost Providence, lost reason itself, and had left me only my five senses, and what could fall under their observation: that is reduced myself to a mere animal. . . . But with these doubts hanging over me it was clear that I could not, as an honest man, present myself before the public as a

> Christian minister. . . . Although I was beginning to acquire a prominent position in the denomination, I felt I ought to leave it. The moment I broke my connection with the Universalists, and took my position openly and above-board, not as a disbeliever, but as an unbeliever, I felt restored to my manhood . . . the most anti-Christian period of my life was the last two years that I was a Universalist preacher.[11]

Orestes Brownson was never satisfied with a purely negative system. He was, as he readily admitted, practical in disposition rather than speculative. He said:

> I sought the truth in order to know what I ought to do. My early religious belief, vague as it was, gave me an end to labor for—that of getting religion and preparing myself by God's grace, for eternal happiness in heaven. Universalism deprived me of that end, as an end to live and labor for, by teaching me that it was just as certain without as with my personal exertions. . . . Universalism had made me doubt the utility of all labors for another world, I was forced to look for work to be done in this world.[12]

Accordingly, Brownson now threw in his lot with two advanced social reformers of the day, Robert Owen and Frances Wright. Owen held that man is passive in the formation of his character, and that by a skillful manipulation of circumstances the ideal character might be developed. Man hitherto had been cursed by a trinity of evils: property, marriage, and religion; Owen's ambition was to abolish them. Brownson had read or rather "studied with great assiduity" the writings of William Godwin. He had read Godwin's *An Enquiry Concerning Principles of Political Justice* as a lad, without understanding. He read it again as a Universalist, and again as a socialist. He said concerning it, "I think it has had more influence on my mind than any other book, except the Scriptures. There is scarcely a modern error that it does not contain." [13]

From 1828, when he renounced Universalism until 1842, when he began to find himself unconsciously tending towards the Catholic Church, he was a socialist, aiming only for the betterment of society. His own description of his viewpoints during this period is clear and concise:

> Our Lord had said "Be not anxious as to what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, or wherewithal ye shall be clothed, for after these things

---

[11] *Works,* V, 3-39. [12] *Ibid.,* p. 40. [13] *Ibid.,* p. 51.

> do the heathen seek." I gave Him a flat denial and said: Be anxious. . . . Man's end for which he is to labor is the well-being and happiness of mankind in this world. . . . I sought truth, I sought knowledge, I sought virtue for no other end, and it was not in seeking to save my soul, to please God, or to have the true religion, that I was led to the Catholic Church but to obtain the means of gaining the earthly happiness of mankind.[14]

Brownson began to revert to religion only when he realized the logical implications of many of the theories held by the advanced Socialistic thinkers. He decided:

> I cannot carry out my reforms without love, disinterestedness, sacrifice. If man is a mere animal, born to propagate his species, and to die and be no more, why shall I love him, and sacrifice myself for him. Men are selfish. . . . They act from habit, from routine, from appetite and passion, and will sacrifice their highest good to their momentary lusts. . . . They see the right, approve it, yet pursue the wrong. . . . I must have a power by which I can overcome what religious people call the flesh. . . . Where am I to find this power except in religious ideas and principles, in belief in God and immortality, in duty, moral accountability? I need, then, religion of some sort as the agent to induce men to make the sacrifices required in adoption of my plans. . . . Certainly, I was far enough from Christian thought; but this conviction, real and sincere, was a step in my ascent from the abyss into which I had fallen. . . . Therefore I accepted religion once more, and resumed my old profession as a preacher, though of what particular Gospel it would be difficult to say.[15]

Jacques Maritain in his *Three Reformers* has shown that the modern world has been afflicted by a triple divorce. There is the divorce of the intellect from its object originating with Descartes; there is divorce of authority and religion originating with Luther; and a divorce of reason and morals originating with Rousseau. It is a common Liberal mistake that the essentials of Western society can be maintained without accepting the truths that sustain them. When Brownson realized even vaguely the necessity of certain basic religious truths to aid his social reforms, he had united morals and reason in their proper wedlock. He was to understand hereafter that an ethic, a code of conduct, should not be separated from the essential truths and dogmas that make the ethic reasonable. He still had far to travel. He observed a rigid separation of religion and authority. The only authority he recognized was his own. "I resumed preaching, but on my own hook, as an independent preacher responsible to no Church, sect or denomination. . . . Do you allege that my creed was unorthodox? What standard of orthodoxy had I as a Protestant? The Bible? . . . For the Protestant, each man's private judgment is the only admissable standard of orthodoxy." [16] His notion of God at this time was vague and indefinite. "I became a believer in humanity, and put humanity in the place of God; the only God I recognized was the divine in man." [17] When he came under the influence of Dr. Channing he offered himself to a Unitarian Congregation in the summer of 1832 and was accepted as their minister. He learned French and a little German and began to read the rationalistic literatures of Germany and France.[18]

---

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 48.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 66.

The writings of Benjamin Constant were instrumental in leading him to the theory that religion is a sentiment natural to man, and ever developing into newer and better forms. This theory harmonized with Brownson's concept of the continuous progress and evolution of society, and he retained it until the later part of 1843.[19] However, he was not during this time settled in mind, except on a few points, and he let it be known that he was a learner and seeker after truth. In "New Views of Christianity, Society and the Church," he set forth his reasons for thinking an entirely new church should supplant both the antiquated Catholic Church and Protestantism which, by its everlasting protests, criticisms, and negations, had split the race into divisions but had no power to reunite them, and make them one mind and one heart.[20] For his views at this time he was largely indebted to Saint Simon.[21]

In 1841 Brownson read one of the famous writings by Abbé de la Mennais, and it had the effect of revolutionizing his philosophical views. He came to understand that "The object affirms itself in the fact of consciousness as object, as distinct from and independent of the subject. . . . Man cannot think without an object. . . . We cannot see where there is nothing to be seen." [22] This may seem an unimportant and obvious discovery; actually it meant that he had healed the divorce between intellect and object, that has been the inheritance of modern man since Descartes. It meant that when he listened to lectures by Theodore Parker in which Parker placed the origin of religion in a religious sentiment natural to man, he saw that from mere internal sentiment alone it is impossible to prove the existence of an external object.[23] Truth is not merely subjective; it is objective. Religion to be true must also be objective, not a mere pious sentiment. It might be well to note here that Cardinal Newman had both a horror and a contempt for those who reduced religion to a formless and gelatinous mass of vague sentiment.[24] It is interesting that Isaac Hecker, founder of the Paulist Fathers and a close friend of Brownson during these years, in writing an article for the *Catholic World,* November, 1887, on "Dr. Brownson and Catholicity" said, "Once the mind is lifted above subjectivism and is face to face with truth, union with the Church is only a question of time and fidelity to conscience." [25]

---

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 67.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 68.

[18] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 70.

[19] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 82.

[20] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 85.

[21] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 93.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 129.

Although Brownson admitted the religious sentiment as in some way natural to man, and that man may be religious without violence to his nature, he did not stop here, but placed the origin of religion in the relation of Creator and creature. He began to catch glimpses of Christian truths, both new and cheering.

A new weekly was founded about this time by a brother of the late Dr. William Ellery Channing. The weekly was called *The Christian World* and Brownson began a series of articles. The first and second series were a delight to the Unitarians. The third and fourth were highly praised by a Puritan journal. The fourth was approved by the Tractarians. The fifth, sixth and seventh received attention from Catholic journals, which reproduced portions of them. The eighth article, "Which is the true Church or body of Christ?" was refused by the publisher of *The Christian World.* It is significant that Newman, too, clarified his position by writing. At the time of his reception into the Church he was engaged in writing his *Essay on Development.*[26]

Brownson was now heading straight for the Catholic Church, but he did not find it easy to submit to its authority. He came for a short period under the influence of the Oxford Movement, although he never thought seriously of joining the Anglican communion. He even suggested in a letter to Isaac Hecker that Hecker might find Anglicanism satisfactory.[27] In 1843, at the age of forty, Brownson started the *Brownson Quarterly,* that he might work through it for the reunion of Christendom.

---

[23] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 153.

[24] Cf. Charles Frederick Harrold, *John Henry Newman* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1945), p. 164.

[25] Rev. Walter Elliott, *Life of Father Hecker,* p. 129.

[26] Cf. *Apologia,* p. 208.

In May 1844 Brownson sought an interview with Bishop Fenwick of Boston, and requested him to arrange for his reception into the Catholic Church. These arrangements were made and in due course he was received. He had finally achieved the union of religion and authority; the union which was severed by Luther's doctrine of private interpretation, to which Brownson along with so many others had fallen heir. He submitted to the Church only after he had satisfied himself that the Catholic Church had the authority from Christ to teach in His name. He said, "In becoming a Presbyterian, I abandoned the use of my reason; in becoming a Catholic I used my reason . . . my act of submission to the Catholic Church was an intelligent, a reasonable act; an act of reason, though indeed of reason assisted by grace, because I had full evidence of the fact that she is God's Church, founded and sustained by Him, and endowed with the authority and ability to teach me in all things pertaining to salvation. Belief on the authority of the Church, supposing that authority adequately proved or provable to reason to be from God, and really His authority, is the most reasonable thing in the world." [28]

From his conversion in 1844 until his death in Detroit, Michigan, April 17, 1876, he ceased to be a "weathercock Brownson" and consistently maintained a staunch Catholicity, which did not however in any way arrest his mental vigor. After years in the Church he could say, "I have, as a Catholic, felt and enjoyed a mental freedom, which I never conceived possible while I was a non-Catholic." [29]

The path which led Newman to Rome has been traced in detail by Newman himself in his *Apologia Pro Vita Sua.* Like Brownson he took delight in the Bible from his earliest years, but he had no settled religious convictions until he was fifteen. At fourteen he read Paine's tract against the Old Testament, some of Hume's essays and some French verses against the immortality of the soul.

---

[27] Cf. *Life of Father Hecker,* p. 130.

[28] *Works,* V, 176.

[29] *Ibid.,* p. 185.

In the autumn of 1816, when he was fifteen, he read some writings of the school of Calvin and fell under the influence of a definite creed. He also read the works of Thomas Scott, to whom Newman said he almost owed his soul. In this same autumn he read selections from the early Fathers and became enamoured of the primitive Church. Upon reading Newton on the Prophecies he became convinced that the Pope was Antichrist, and vestiges of this notion remained even till the year 1843.[30]

He entered Oxford in 1816, took his degree in 1821, and was elected a fellow at Oriel in 1822. He was ordained to the Anglican ministry in 1824 and spent two years in parochial activity as curate of St. Clement's, Oxford. During this time he gained a notion of the Catholic doctrine of tradition and came to believe in Apostolic succession.

In 1828 he was named Vicar of St. Mary's. In 1833 he became one of the leaders in the "Oxford Movement." His aim was to defend the principle of dogma against liberalism, and by liberalism he meant, the anti-dogmatic principle. He said, "Dogma has been the fundamental principle of my religion: I know no other religion; religion, as a mere sentiment, is to me a dream and a mockery." [31] Some of the specific dogmas that he defended were the existence of a visible Church with Sacraments and rites which were channels of grace. He maintained that the Anglican Church was a "Via Media" and a true and legitimate branch of the Catholic Church. It was only when he found this theory indefensible that he entered the Catholic Church.

It was difficult, he realized, to make out how the Eutychians or Monophysites were heretics, unless Protestants and Anglicans were heretics also . . . difficult to condemn Popes of the sixteenth century, without condemning Popes of the fifth. Shortly after he finished reading the history of the Monophysites he read an article on the "Anglican Claim" by Bishop Wiseman in the *Dublin Review.* The article was on the Donatists with an application to Anglicanism. Wiseman used a quotation from St. Augustine, "Securus judicat orbis terrarum" which startled Newman into seeing the inadequacy of this theory. He was forced to admit "that the deliberate judgment, in which the whole Church at length rests and acquiesces, is an infallible prescription and a final sentence against such portions of it as protest and secede." [32] This was for Newman the handwriting on the wall, he saw it in 1839. As he remarked, "He who has seen a ghost, cannot be as if he had never seen it." He finally entered the Church in 1845, a year after Brownson.

---

[30] Cf. *Apologia,* p. 33.

[31] *Ibid.,* p. 67.

Newman endeavored to be a Catholic without joining the Catholic Church. He joined it in the end. After becoming a Catholic he said, "I have been in perfect peace and contentment. I never had had one doubt. I was not conscious to myself, on my conversion, of any difference of thought or of temper from what I had before. . . . I had no more fervour, but it was like coming into port after a rough sea." [33]

Brownson writing in his *Review* in 1848 said, "Historical Christianity and Catholicity are undeniably identical. The Catholic Church is clearly the Church of history." [34]

Newman in his *Apologia* has a provocative passage "I came to the conclusion that there is no medium in true philosophy between Atheism and Catholicity, and that a perfectly consistent mind, under those circumstances in which it finds itself here below, must embrace either one or the other. And I hold this still: I am a Catholic by virtue of my believing in God." [35] Brownson found much in Newman with which to disagree, but to Newman's proposition as just stated, he would surely have subscribed with enthusiasm.

WALTER SULLIVAN, C.S.P.

Detroit, Michigan.

---

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 121.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 215.

[34] *Works*, V, 247.

[35] *Apologia*, p. 186.

THE PRIESTHOOD AND HOLINESS

If, however, your work is to be blessed by God and produce abundant fruit, it must be rooted in holiness of life. Sanctity, as We have said, is the chief and most important endowment of the Catholic priest. Without it, other gifts will not go far. With it, even supposing other gifts be meagre, the priest can work marvels.

—Pope Pius XI, in his encyclical *Ad Catholici sacerdotii*, issued Dec. 20, 1935.

DOORBELL APOSTOLATE

"Good afternoon! Say, that's a nice puppy you have there. How old is he?"

"Born just six weeks ago; he is a pretty dog, isn't he? I hope he's as good on rabbits as his mother was."

"I'm Father ...., the Catholic priest from town, you know St. .... Church. I'm making a visit through this whole neighborhood to see if I know all my people. Has anyone that's living here ever been baptized a Catholic?"

I don't know how many hundreds or thousands of times I have been "party of the first part" in conversations beginning like this, mostly in the rural counties of southwestern New York State. But I do know that a lot of apostolic work can be done pushing doorbells.

A priest can talk to people about God and religion, all types of people, any number of people, if he will visit them in their homes. It is a profitable work, for God and souls, this doorbell apostolate.

There was Mrs. F . . . Born of a mixed marriage in a nearby city, she had been baptized as a baby and given just enough instruction to make her first Holy Communion as a girl. The family then moved out to the country and that was the end of her religious instruction or church-going for many years.

When Mrs. F. graduated from high school she went back to the city and got a job. Conscious of her lack of religious knowledge, she eventually presented herself at the rectory for instructions. She practiced her faith then for a couple of years until she met Mr. F., who still calls himself "not church minded." They were married by a Justice of the Peace and lived in various places in the next five years. Three children had been born and none of them were baptized "when the doorbell rang."

At the present writing Mrs. F.'s marriage has been validated; she, herself, goes to Mass every Sunday and receives Holy Communion frequently. All the children are baptized and one made her first Holy Communion last year. Even Mr. F. was "church minded" that day. He isn't as far away as he thinks.

Mr. and Mrs. J. were both at home when I called. They shamefacedly confessed that they were both Catholics with a good Catholic background. Married fifteen years and living in another part of the state, neither had ever missed Mass until they bought this farm nine months ago. When I expressed surprise at never having seen them in church, they explained it this way.

Arriving at the farm after a day long drive, they found the house in an awful mess after the departing tenants. The two of them worked far into the night, scrubbing and cleaning so that at least they would have a decent place to sleep. The next morning they awoke late. Not knowing the exact location of the nearest church and still all tired out, they thought they were justified in skipping this one Sunday.

During the week Mr. J. got a job in the factory in the neighboring village and worked evenings putting in some crops and getting the outbuildings in shape. Mrs. J. slaved over her garden and house. This had gone on for nine months.

The place did look fine, I had to confess that, but there were nine months lost as far as the service of God was concerned. Mr. and Mrs. J. were at Mass the next Sunday and every succeeding Sunday. You couldn't ask for better parishioners.

Mrs. D. was distraught when she came to the door. The baby in her arms was crying, and loud. Jimmy, the creeper, had just pulled over her best lamp; and Sue, the toddler, was succeeding in her efforts to reach the china doll on the bric-a-brac stand. When a comparative tranquillity of order was finally restored, Mrs. D. stated that no, she wasn't a Catholic; in fact, what with the farm and children and all, they never went to church anymore. She was glad to meet me, a Catholic priest. Couldn't she make me a cup of tea or something? They had some fine Catholic neighbors where they used to live. And George, that's her husband, and she had often said that they'd like to know more about the Catholic Church. They knew that they ought to be going to church someplace. It wasn't right to bring the children up without prayers or anything.

George had a man-sized schedule then and has yet. After working all day in the city, he would still be in the barn when I came for instructions about nine every Monday evening. Many a time his head would droop while he listened, only to be lifted shyly after a sharp reprimand from Mrs. D. But how that man could ask questions after the formal lesson was over! I used to feel sorry for him when I called a halt at eleven, knowing the day he had before him.

Mrs. D. is a Catholic now and all the children, seven to the present. Mr. D.? Well, he doesn't want to take on any new obligations at the moment. The Church is the right church, everything you said is true, Father. But gosh! I can't right now. He likes to see his wife and children go and he will himself, when he gets time. Please God that he does get time.

Stanley was born down in Pennsylvania. He knew that he was baptized a Catholic and he vaguely remembered having gone to church a couple of times as a boy. They lived a long way from town and he was sure that it wasn't oftener than that. He had left home as soon as he could and kicked around quite a bit. Now he was married and settled on this farm.

There was a faintly belligerent tone in Stanley's voice. He wasn't a bit pleased to see me and I wondered what was at the bottom of it. It finally came out that he had met a priest or two after he had grown up, through relatives who were practicing Catholics. They had been after him to go to Mass. He didn't know what that was and he thought that he was doing all right and he wasn't going to be pushed around.

In the course of our next few talks, I told Stanley that he had been given something very valuable in the gift of faith at Baptism and that before he finally discarded it, he ought to know a little more about it to see whether that's what he really wanted to do. Stanley thought that was a fair proposition and so we began regular convert instructions. Stanley is doing all right now though inclined to be a little lazy. He still doesn't want to be pushed around but he can be talked to.

Now don't get me wrong. You don't run into all these people in one afternoon nor maybe in a month of afternoons. But you do run into them. You turn that car key on and off many times, you are an authority on front doorbells and back door stoops, you tramp many hundreds of yards up between the corn stalks before you meet another Mrs. D. or another Stanley. But when you do meet him you are glad you came.

And meanwhile. . . .

Fr. Paul Hanly Furfey says: "The priest makes converts when he talks about Christ and the Church to non-Catholics or fallen-away Catholics individually or in small conversational groups. . . . The priest should eagerly seize every opportunity to talk to outsiders about religion, and, moreover, he should go out of his way to create opportunities." [1]

So meanwhile . . . while you are waiting for Mr. and Mrs. J. or Mrs. F. to turn up, was there ever an opportunity more made to order for a Catholic priest to talk religion to non-Catholics? He is in their home where they are least self-conscious and strange. He has a perfect right to be there. He presented himself at their door on a perfectly legitimate errand and they invited him inside. They are impressed by his zeal in thus going from house to house to serve his parishioners and should-be-parishioners. They are put at ease by his smiling at-easeness. So now that he is here, why not ask him a few questions?

Mr. and Mrs. P. are Protestants. They go to church every Sunday and they have seen the "Reverend" very often as they drive by his church. Is it true that Catholics worship statues? And why do they confess their sins to a priest? And why don't priests get married? And . . .? And . . .?

"Thank you, Reverend . . . er . . . Father, it was mighty nice of you to drop in. Come again when you are in the neighborhood."

Bill and Helen are young and they never go to church at all. "Got fed up with it. A lot of old ladies singing out of tune. Is it like that in your church? And looking to see who comes in."

"Sure there's a God, or at least I guess there is." That makes an opportunity for at least a few words on man's relation to and obligations towards His Creator, a little explanation of the necessity of public worship. "Gee, I never looked at it that way. Well, we'll think it over. Thanks for stopping in. Come again, won't you?"

Experiences like that are legion. The Catholic priest is a respected member of the community where he lives. In a sense, it is an honor for anyone, Catholic, Protestant, or pagan, to have him visit the house. And in small towns and in the country, an unexpected visitor is a break from the monotony of an ordinary working day or a quiet evening by the fireside. I've seen many more smiles on farmers' faces at the excuse for taking a few minutes rest than I have seen frowns of irritation at the delay in their work.

---

[1] "Is Ours a Missionary Country?" *AER*, CXX, 1 (January, 1949), 10 f.

And bigotry? Yes, it still exists. But it is not very apparent on a person-to-person basis. You meet cold people, occasionally people that just don't want to be bothered. But I could count on the fingers of one hand the times that I have been rudely turned away because I am a Catholic priest.

The Catholic Church in America faces a missionary problem. With all our twenty-five or thirty millions of Catholics, our beautiful churches, our wonderful educational system, our program of charitable and social services, there are still over one hundred million fellow Americans who are not Catholics and who should be.

And at the same time that many converts are being received into the church, many Catholics, no one knows how many, are each year abandoning their last contact with the Church and slipping into a merely natural existence.

The problem is particularly complex in the large cities. I know from observation how priests work from morning till night, with communion calls, classes in the parochial school, released time instructions, marriage instructions, rectory calls, direction of parish societies, devotions, confessions, etc. . . . and all this without ever coming into contact with lapsed Catholics or non-Catholics on any kind of systematic basis. The mobility of the city population adds to the problem and it seems that the families that are the most mobile and experience the least contact with the Church in the form of her priests, are the very ones that need that contact the most.

The problem is being analyzed and solved in various ways. Missions for non-Catholics, inquiry classes, sister census-takers, information centers are impressive in their results. But the concensus of opinion seems to be that an apostolic-minded laity, mediators between the unchurched and the priest, is the ultimate answer.

An apostolic-minded Catholic laity will be of inestimable value in the small-town and country areas too. But while he is working on that, there is a program that the average priest can put into effect immediately that will bring immediate results.

(1) He can visit his Mass-missers, fallen aways, bad marriages, regularly, once a month, once every six weeks, as often as he can reasonably manage. Judicious planning, to cram the most visits into the fewest miles, and judicious pruning, to make a fifteen-

minute visit as relaxed and unhurried as an hour-long one, will enable him to visit a surprising number of families in a day.

Pleasant, confident, serious, he will be pretty tired mentally after an excursion of this kind, trying to figure out in each particular individual the barrier to better practice of the Faith, and the vocal medicine that will strengthen the weak, prod the lazy, give spiritual insight to the material minded. But he will be very pleased on a Sunday morning after such a foraging tour.

(2) He can institute a continuous census of the geographical territory of the parish. Perhaps he will be able to get around his parish every year or oftener, perhaps only once in two years. Each time he will discover new lapsed Catholic families, he will renew and develop contacts made previously with non-Catholics, he will make additional acquaintances with non-Catholic lately come to the area.

This continuous census ought to be a leisurely affair, characterized by a genuine interest in whomever he is talking to at the moment. He should not go out if he is feeling tired or irritable. This might well be the only contact these people will have with the Catholic Church this year, or ever. They will remember the Church as they remember him.

Inevitably he will run into interest in the Church that demands further attention. That leads to step (3).

(3) He can visit those non-Catholics whom he has discovered to be particularly interested in the Catholic Church regularly, once a month, once every six weeks, with a view towards building up that interest into regular weekly convert instructions and reception into the Church. These visits can be weaved into the visiting of fallen-aways in the same neighborhood although they take a little more time. I think it is a good thing to have one thing to talk about and then leave a pamphlet on that subject. Very often this plan may be sidetracked by questions but that isn't bad, it's good. And he can leave the pamphlet anyway.

The priest should be careful not to make these visits just social calls. He is a priest and he is coming because these people are interested in the Catholic Church. He knows it to be the true Church and he wishes them to have that knowledge also. He likes them, and they like him, but that is something else again.

And he should not be afraid to pop the question. "Here I have been telling you, on and off, little things about the Catholic Church. Why don't we start at the beginning and look into the whole business? You could set aside an hour a week and so could I. It will take three or four months but you aren't putting yourself under any kind of obligation. You can't make up your mind to anything until we get well along in the explanation. You can't want what you don't know. But if this is Christ's one, true Church, you owe yourself a good look at it."

That program, faithfully adhered to, works. It won't turn the world upside down overnight but it will fill your country or small-town church. And with a balanced diet served inside, it will keep it filled.

JOHN J. NEYLON

The Diocese of Buffalo Missionary Apostolate
Cattaraugus, N. Y.

THE EUCHARIST AND THE CHURCH

This Sacrament is, as it were, the very soul of the Church; and to it the grace of the priesthood is ordered and directed in all its fulness and in each of its successive grades. From the same source the Church draws and has all her strength, all her glory, her every supernatural endowment and adornment, every good thing that is hers. Therefore she makes it the greatest of all her cares to prepare the hearts of the faithful for an intimate union with Christ through the Sacrament of His body and blood, and to draw them thereto. And to this end she strives to promote the veneration of this august mystery by surrounding it with holy ceremonies.

—Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical *Mirae caritatis*, issued May 28, 1902.

OUR LADY'S QUEENLY PREROGATIVES

In its prayers to Our Blessed Lady and in its statement of that portion of God's revealed message that describes her position in the economy of salvation the Catholic Church speaks of her as a queen. The title occurs in Greek patristic literature as early as the eighth century, when St. Andrew of Crete designated Our Lady as *βασιλίς*[1] and St. Germanus of Constantinople spoke of her as *βασίλισση*.[2] Alcuin used the term *regina* in speaking of Our Lady late in that same century in the Latin West. The various antiphons and the *Laudes Mariae,* popularized during the twelfth century, tended to make this title one of the favorite designations employed by Our Lady's clients in their prayers and in their sermons about her. The Litany of Loreto, formally approved by Pope Sixtus V in 1587, made Our Lady's queenly titles a part of the most intimate and beloved language of Catholic devotion.

The early history of this designation, as well as of the closely related Greek Κυρία and the Latin *domina,* has been very well treated by Fr. Barré in his articles "Le royauté de Marie pendant les neufs premiers siecles."[3] This work is obviously one of very great importance for the proper development of contemporary theology about Our Lady's prerogatives. Only through writings of this kind will it be possible to appreciate the background and hence the complete meaning of what the literature of Christian devotion has to say about the royal status of Our Blessed Mother.

It is, of course, absolutely essential that the Catholics of our time and of our country should be brought to appreciate the tremendous wealth of content in Our Lady's queenly titles. We live in an age when advertising has so affected the value of language that men are ready to think that no attribution is strictly true. Words are applied to articles of commerce, to economic systems, and to politicians, not because they accurately delineate the traits of these various realities, but simply because, in the mind of the advertiser or publicist, they seem able to make people adopt a favorable attitude towards their products.

---

[1] Cf. *Hom. II In Dormitione Sanctae Deiparae, MPG,* XCVII, 1079.

[2] Cf. *Hom. I In Praesentatione, MPG,* XCVIII, 303.

[3] In *Recherches de science religieuse,* XXIX (April and June, 1939).

The people of our day, reading an advertisement, are never tempted to imagine that its highly laudatory content is literally true. There is always the serious danger that persons of this type may be misled into imagining that the praises of Our Lady, and particularly her designation as queen, are only hyperbolical locutions employed to attract a favorable attitude on the part of the devout. A man who would be deceived into accepting this erroneous notion of Catholic teaching about Our Lady would have suffered an irreparable loss in the life of divine faith.

Thus it is distinctly the business of the Catholic priest to understand and to preach the reality of Our Lady's queenly prerogatives. The children of Our Blessed Mother must not be left in danger of misinterpreting or of denying the riches of divine grace which have been given to her. They must not be placed in a position where they may fail to appreciate the function in the life of the Church of that Queen through whom the merciful graces of Christ her Son come to the men and women for whom He died on Calvary.

The choice of the word "queen" to designate Our Blessed Mother is, in itself, a striking example of the process by which, according to the Council of the Vatican, the human mind can gain some fruitful understanding of the revealed mysteries. The Council tells us that when the human intelligence, enlightened by faith and fortified by the proper dispositions, seeks such understanding from God, it can obtain its objective "through a comparison of the revealed mysteries with truths of the natural order and by comparing the mysteries with each other and with the last end of man." [4] Such a process manifestly took place in the selection of the word "queen" to designate Our Lady and in the theological development of the notion of her queenship.

From the fact that the queenly title was not attributed to Our Lady in Catholic literature until a comparatively late period, it would appear that the term itself did not appear in that section of the original deposit of faith which treated of Mary and her place in the economy of salvation. It is manifest, however, that the status and the characteristics which the original deposit of revelation described her as possessing were found to be such that, by reason of them, the queenly title could correctly be given to her. The *ecclesia docens* discovered that it could express accurately a portion of what the original deposit of faith had to say about Our Lady by saying that she actually possesses *queenly* dignity and power.

---

[4] Cf. *DB,* 1796.

The word "queen" is, of course, employed analogously when it is predicated of Our Lady and of some woman who exercises royal dominion in a temporal society. Objectively Our Blessed Mother's position and power are quite distinct from those of any earthly queen. Our Lady's prerogatives belong within the framework of the supernatural order. Her dignity forms a part of that sphere of reality which we know as the supernatural mysteries. The position of a woman who holds a queenly place merely within some civil society belongs to a lower order of reality.

We must remember, on the other hand, that although the word "queen" is applied to Our Lady by analogy, that analogy is proper rather than merely metaphorical. There is metaphorical analogy when the word employed is such that its formal definition is inapplicable to the reality it serves to describe. Thus, when Our Lord is described as "the Lion of Juda," it is manifest that the proper definition of the word "lion" cannot be applied to Him. The term helps us to understand something of the function of Christ by showing that there exists a certain similarity between the effects produced by the lion upon those against whom he enters into conflict and the effects produced by Our Lord on those forces which strive to undo His work.

The formal meaning of the word "queen," however, does apply to Our Lady. A queen is a woman who, through association with a king, occupies a position of unique dignity and influence within a realm. This definition obviously applies to the Virgin Mother of God. Through her association with her Divine Son, Christ the King, she occupies a place apart in the created universe, and especially within that supernatural kingdom of her Son, the Catholic Church. Her position is such that God's graces come to His children through her intercession. The men and women for whom Our Lord died on the Cross are empowered to pray to her and thus to beg her intercession at the throne of God. Thus, despite the fact that queenship in a merely temporal kingdom is something quite distinct from and ineffably inferior to the status of Mary, the formal meaning of the word "queen" applies to her properly and preeminently.

Before any term is used analogously to express some meaning contained in God's supernatural revealed message, that word must be purified, that is, explained in such a way that its exact meaning in this situation is made clear. In the case of the term "queen," as applied to Our Blessed Lady, this purification involves an explanation excluding certain uses of the term which are definitely not a part of its meaning in Mariology. In the first place, when we designate Our Lady as a queen, we do not mean to imply that she occupies a position analogous to that of a woman who holds the supreme royal power within a temporal kingdom. Such a woman, in the last analysis, is a kind of substitute king. She holds her place only because there was no eligible male claimant to the throne. Her position and her power in the civil society are exactly those a king would have possessed, in the event that there had been an acceptable male candidate for the sovereignty.

Our Lady, on the other hand, enjoys and exercises her regal prerogatives within the kingdom of her Divine Son. She is neither a substitute ruler nor the source of sovereignty within the realm. Her ineffable dignity and glory proceed precisely from her union with Our Lord. She has the power to distribute His graces to her children only because of her association with Him. In the designs of God's providence, the Incarnation of the Word of God was made contingent upon the consent of Mary. God chose to give her this central and dominating position in the economy of salvation in such a way that through her intercession His graces come to the children of men. Thus Mary's royal power is always in the direction of the distribution of divine favors. It is precisely the power of Christ's mother. It is the power of the woman associated with Christ the King in that intimately unique way according to which, by the decrees of divine providence itself, His gifts come to men through her.

The Church further explains the concept of queenship as applied to Our Lady when it insists that her influence in the kingdom of her Son is analogous to that of the wife of a king in an earthly monarchy. The most intimate association in the ordinary run of mankind is that of the matrimonial bond. Hence the woman most closely associated with a merely temporal king is his wife. In the divine design of the Incarnation, however, it was decreed that Mary the Mother of Christ should be associated with her Son and with his redemptive work in a uniquely intimate fashion. It is precisely because of the singular position God has given her as the mother of Christ that she is truly and properly designated as queen of Our Lord's realm.

We must remember, furthermore, that the queenship of Mary must not be construed as a mere pre-eminence among the subjects of her Divine Son. The name "queen" is sometimes applied to a woman who excells in some particular art or activity. In this loose sense the title might be applied to a woman who is judged to be the best among writers of poetry or among tennis players.

Although it remains perfectly true that Our Blessed Lady surpasses all other creatures in excellence, her queenly title does not in any way limit itself to a declaration of this superiority. The title is always manifestive of the fact that Our Lady possesses and exercises a genuine dominative and queenly influence upon the subjects and the members of her Son, as well as the fact that she is much more richly endowed by God with supernatural goods than any other creature.

Moreover, Our Lady's queenship in the kingdom of her Divine Son is something which she acquired through her co-operation in the work of the redemption. Our Lord merited His dominion over all rational creatures and especially over the Church of God by His redemptive sacrifice. Thus Our Lady's queenship was likewise earned by Christ. Her own participation in the act of redemption, however, was also effective, through Christ and in subjection to Him, in bringing about her queenly position and influence within His domain.

Thus, when the Church hails Our Lady as queen of various classes of saints, and of the saints as a group, it does not mean merely that she possessed and exercised the virtues and gifts proper to every group of saints in a more perfect degree than the saints within each individual category. When the Church designates her as the Queen of the Apostles, it does not mean merely that she possesses the faith and the missionary ardor characteristic of the apostolic college more intensely than the Apostles themselves. Actually Our Lady is the Queen of the Apostles, not only for that reason, but also and principally because the virtues and gifts belonging to the apostolic vocation were given to their recipients by reason of her intercession.

That title belongs to Mary also by reason of the fact that the apostles, as the beneficiaries of her intercession, labored for the furtherance of what is truly her kingdom, because it is essentially the kingdom of her Divine Son. The treasures of divine grace poured forth upon the apostolic college came to the members of that college by reason of her *fiat* and through her intercession. They were expended in what was, in the last analysis, her cause. She is the queen of the kingdom of which the apostles were, under Christ, the living foundations.

She is likewise truly the queen of the patriarchs and of the prophets, of the heroes of the Church of the Old Covenant. All of the supernatural gifts accorded to and exercised by these men came to them by reason of the pre-applied merits of Our Lord and Saviour. The Church of the old dispensation, like that of the New Testament, was truly and completly the Church of Christ, the kingdom of the Son of God. Since the Incarnation itself, and all the graces which proceed from it, were, in the ineffable designs of God's providence, made contingent upon Our Lady's consent, it follows that the graces received in the Church of the Old Testament as well as those given under the New Covenant have come from Mary. And, in the intimacy of her association with Our Lord and through the perfection of her subjection to Him, she is the queen of His kingdom throughout all its extension in time. The kingdom of God for which the patriarchs and the prophets worked and prayed is the realm within which Our Lady is queen.

Because the angels too are included in the kingdom of her Son, Our Lady is the queen of the angels themselves. Where the dominion of Christ extends, there too is to be found the beneficent and royal influence of His mother. Thus she is truly queen of all the saints, of all men, of all God's creation.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

CONCERNING THE *ORATIO IMPERATA*

Question 1: In Wuest-Mullaney's *Matters Liturgical* (p. 156) we read: "If two collects are prescribed and one of them is said, the other must be said also." In our diocese two are prescribed, that for peace *pro re gravi* and that for the Pope *simpliciter.* Are we to conclude from the above that *Pro Papa* may be omitted only when *Pro Pace* is? That would be equivalent to making both *pro re gravi.*

Question 2: May a bishop prescribe an *oratio imperata* for an indefinite period even if he renews it from year to year? One diocese has had the *Pro Papa* as an *oratio imperata* for a least twenty-five years. This seems improper as the Pope is prayed for *nominatim* in the beginning of the Canon at every Mass. When an *oratio imperata* is prescribed for so long a time, it becomes practically a permanent addition to the Mass, which only the Holy See may command.

Answer 1: The words of *Matters Liturgical,* quoted above, are indeed a bit confusing. We understand the author's meaning to be that both prescribed collects are to be said when the rubrics allow an *imperata* of the class of both. Thus, on days when the simple *imperata* is allowed, the obligation is not fulfilled by saying only the one *pro re gravi,* which is also commanded. When there are three orations in the Mass and the collect *pro re gravi* is added, the other collect, *ordinarie imperata,* should not be omitted on the grounds that, *in casu,* four orations have already been said and the general rule is that four orations exclude the *oratio ordinarie imperata.*

Answer 2: We understand that an *oratio imperata* corresponds to some emergency and hence should not be made a subject of permanent legislation by the bishop. The general law of the Church which may be invoked in this matter is Canon 1257 of the *Codex Juris* where we read: "Unius Apostolicae Sedis est . . . sacram ordinare liturgiam." There are times, however, when there is special reason for a particular prayer for the Pope, in addition to the mention of him in the *Te igitur* prayer, and the emergency may continue for a long period, as at the present day.

JUDAICA PERFIDIA ON GOOD FRIDAY

Question: In the series of prayers for all classes of persons in the Good Friday services, just before the uncovering of the cross, the prayer for the Jews refers to them as *perfidi judaei* and again speaks of their *judaica perfidia.* Does not this seem a bit harsh in the prayers which this day are so all-embracing as to include Jews and pagans, heretics and schismatics?

Answer: This same question was recently proposed to the Congregation of Sacred Rites and in the answer to it, by the decree of June 10, 1948, it was explained that the *judaica perfidia* and *perfidi judaei,* expressed in the invitation to prayer and the oration following, were to be understood to refer to the Jews as *infideles* and their mental attitude as *infidelitas,* in so far as they were (culpably) unbelieving, guilty of *infidelitas in credendo.*

UNIATES OR CATHOLICS

Question: Is it incorrect to refer to members of Eastern Churches united with Rome as Uniates of the various rites or is it more proper to speak of them as Catholics of those rites?

Answer: We understand, despite older usage, illustrated, for example, by the title of Fortescue's *The Uniate Eastern Churches,* that the term "Uniate" has acquired a contemptuous meaning, when applied to members of Eastern Churches in communion with the Holy See, very much as the word "Papist" spoken of Roman Catholics. So, now, adherents of these Churches prefer to be called Armenian Catholics, Catholics of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite, Syrian Catholics, and Coptic Catholics.

TIME FOR SINGING THE INTROIT

Question: Our choirmaster has expressed a desire to begin the singing of the Introit as the celebrant enters the sanctuary instead of waiting until the beginning of the prayers at the foot of the altar? Is this permissible?

Answer: The practice referred to is not only permissible but the correct procedure. The latest Vatican edition of the *Graduale Romanum* has the following direction: "Accedente Sacerdote ad Altare incipiunt Cantores Antiphonam ad Introitum." This evidently is to be translated as meaning that the Introit is to be begun as the celebrant approaches the altar, in other words, when he is entering the sanctuary. An old decree of the Congregation of Sacred Rites (No. 2424, 7) prescribed that the singing of the Introit should not be commenced until the celebrant had reached the foot of the steps of the altar but this direction has become obsolete because of the later rubric quoted above. The revision of the procedure to be followed is more in accord with the origin of the Introit as a processional hymn to be sung as the celebrant and his assistants passed through the church on the way to the altar.

WHEN A HOST IS DROPPED IN DISTRIBUTING HOLY COMMUNION

Question: Has there been any change in the regulations concerning purifying the floor after a Host has been accidentally dropped on it during the distribution of Holy Communion? We have heard that the careful purification of the spot is no longer required, unless particles are visible, but that the priest simply picks up the fallen Host and proceeds with the giving of the Holy Communion.

Answer: So far as we know the directions of the rubrics of the Missal (*De defectibus,* Tit. X, 15), concerning the procedure to be followed when a Host is dropped on the floor, still remain in force. This procedure requires that the spot on which the Sacred Host has fallen be purified, usually with a dampened purificator, and then scraped and the scrappings thrown into the sacrarium. Authors, generally, in order to avoid delay in going on with the distribution of Holy Communion, interpret the fulfillment of the rubric to allow marking the spot on which the Sacred Host has fallen, either with a linen cloth or with the plate used with the cruets, the priest returning after Mass to purify the place in the manner prescribed in *De defectibus.*

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

MEAT ON FRIDAY

Question: If a Catholic dines in the home of a non-Catholic friend on a Friday and meat is served, may he partake of it on the score that the embarrassment he would cause his friend by a refusal would constitute a sufficient *incommodum* to excuse him from the law of abstinence?

Answer: This case is of frequent occurrence nowadays in the United States, and it would seem that some priests are too ready to give a lenient decision. Now, it is true, there are theologians who state that a Catholic may eat meat which he unexpectedly finds prepared for dinner at a friend's house on a day of abstinence. Such is the opinion of Damen (*Theologia moralis* [Turin, 1947], I, n. 1065) and Merkelbach (*Summa theologiae moralis* [Paris, 1938], II, n. 967). However, these theologians add that an excusing cause is present only when some *grave* inconvenience would ensue if the Catholic abstained from the meat or departed without waiting for dinner. Furthermore, it must be emphasized that if the meat were set before the Catholic in contempt of religion, or if it is foreseen that his partaking of it would be the occasion of grave scandal, he must abstain. Now in our country there would rarely be grave inconvenience to anyone if a Catholic in the circumstances described courteously declined the meat portion of the dinner. The host might be slightly embarrassed, but he could not reasonably be offended at the guest's adherence to the dictates of his conscience. Moreover, there would usually be no difficulty in providing the Catholic guest with an adequate meal of abstinence food. Furthermore, if a Catholic eats meat in this situation there will frequently be scandal. The other guests may not comment on his conduct in his presence, but they will observe it, and to the Catholics it may be an incentive to be more lax in interpreting the law themselves, to the non-Catholics it may furnish the occasion to denounce Catholics in general as inconsistent people and even hypocrites. Accordingly, a priest who is consulted in a case of this kind should ordinarily answer that the Catholic guest is obliged to refuse the meat. If there are added circumstances in a particular case which point to a grave inconvenience in the event of a refusal, and there is no danger of scandal or contempt of religion, a lenient decision may be given; but this must be regarded as an exceptional case.

CONDITIONS FOR PLENARY INDULGENCE

Question 1: When a person wishes to gain on the same day several different plenary indulgences, each of which calls for a visit to the church and prayers for the Pope, must both visit and prayers be repeated for each indulgence, or will it suffice to visit the Church once and then recite the prayers as many times as there are indulgences to be gained?

Question 2: Is it sufficient to constitute a separate visit that one go into the sacristy or vestibule of the church, then return, or must one go outside the church edifice?

Answer 1: Canon 933 states: "By one and the same work to which indulgences are annexed from various titles several indulgences cannot be gained unless the required work is confession or communion, or unless it is expressly provided for otherwise." From this it certainly seems to follow that one who wishes to gain several plenary indulgences on the same day must make a separate visit to the church for each indulgence that calls for this condition. This is corroborated by a decree of the Congregation of Indulgences, given on Feb. 29, 1864, which clearly states that as many separate visits to the church are to be made as indulgences to be gained, when a visit to a church is stipulated as one of the conditions of each indulgence (*Coll. Auth.*, n. 399).

Answer 2: The sacristy and the vestibule are considered to be outside the church in reference to certain matters *(odiosa)* such as violation by bloodshed, but are regarded as parts of the church in reference to others *(favorabilia)* such as the right of asylum (cf. Merkelbach, *Summa theologiae moralis* [Paris 1938], II, n. 805). It would seem therefore than an indulgence could be gained by a visit made in the vestibule or sacristy; consequently since in this matter these places are considered parts of the church one would have to go outside of them in order to separate two visits to the church.

DISPENSATION OF A DEACON

Question: In *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for February, 1949 (p. 98) it is stated that in danger of death, under certain conditions, a deacon may be dispensed from the obligation of celibacy and allowed to marry. Will you please explain this more fully?

Answer: This is one of the powers possessed by a local Ordinary when there is danger of death and the marriage is called for, either to procure peace of conscience *(ad consulendum conscientiae)* or for the sake of legitimizing children (Canon 1043). The same power is possessed, with certain qualifications, by the pastor, the priest who assists at a marriage in accordance with Canon 1098, § 2, and the confessor (Canon 1044). It may be used if either the deacon or the woman he wishes to marry is in danger of death, provided the aforesaid reasons are present. As was stated in the article to which the questioner refers, it is a most practical procedure for a hospital chaplain to procure from the local Ordinary the delegation of his (the Ordinary's) power given by Canon 1043—at least to the extent that it can be used by the chaplain when the Ordinary cannot be reached. Actually this faculty is delegated to the priests in a considerable number of dioceses of the United States (cf. Snee-Clark, *Diocesan Faculties in the United States* [Woodstock, 1948], p. 24).

Hence, by virtue of this faculty a deacon (or subdeacon) can be dispensed from the diriment impediment of Sacred Orders and allowed to marry if he or the woman is in danger of death and one of the reasons required is present. The reason *ad consulendum conscientiae* would be present if marriage will be the means of removing the parties from the occasion of sin, as would usually be the case if they have been living in concubinage. The other reason, the legitimation of offspring, surely applies to children who may be born in future; but the Code states that children already born *(proles sacrilega)* are not legitimated by the granting of a dispensation from a diriment impediment (Canon 1051). However, the marriage would render it easier to obtain in the future the legitimation of the sacrilegious offspring from the Holy See (cf. Aertnys-Damen, *Theologia moralis* [Turin, 1947], II, n. 774).

Formerly it was commanded that an account of such a marriage be sent to the Holy Office, in the event that the sick person recovered; but this is no longer prescribed in the Code. However, the necessity of avoiding scandal demands that in the event of recovery the couple move to some place where the status of the man is unknown.

Fr. G. O'Keeffe, in his doctrinal dissertation *Matrimonial Dispensations, Powers of Bishops, Priests and Confessors* (Washington, D. C., Catholic University Press, 1927), has this interesting comment:

> The question remains, do these vows (Major Orders and Solemn Religious Vows), after such a dispensation has been granted, continue to bind outside the lawful use of marriage, and still constitute a canonical impediment regarding future marriages, if the occasion of such should ever arise? The canon itself perhaps can find no apodictic argument, but nevertheless it would point to an affirmative response, for it authorizes the Ordinary to dispense from the *impediments,* and mentions nothing of the vows themselves. Moreover, a consideration of the old law would seem to render this interpretation certain (p. 76).

RETICENCE ON CERTAIN DOCTRINES

Question: Does the Church ever observe a prudential silence regarding certain doctrines in order to avoid adverse criticism and opposition from non-Catholics?

Answer: In the performance of her magisterial duty the Church is not swayed by worldly prudence. Her divinely granted commission binds her to teach the whole deposit of Christian faith without compromise and without any minimizing of the sacred truths entrusted to her care. It is true, with the passing of the centuries it may become unnecessary to emphasize certain revealed doctrines that were formerly stressed, because there is no longer any opposition to these doctrines. Thus, nowadays the Church does not have to devote much time or energy to the doctrine that Jesus Christ possessed a real physical body, though in the early centuries this tenet had to be emphasized because of the peculiar notion of the Docetists. But it is very different to say that the Church is induced by the fear of non-Catholic opposition to "soft-pedal" certain doctrines. Certain individual Catholics may be guilty of such a weakness, but the Church in her official capacity teaches her doctrine in the manner and to the extent required for the spiritual welfare of souls, irrespective of the hatred and antagonism that may be roused on the part of her enemies.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Analecta

The December, 1948, number of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* reports, along with other acts of the Holy See, the allocution delivered by our Holy Father on Nov. 25, 1948,[1] to the representatives of the provinces of the Capuchin Fathers. Our Holy Father expressed his pleasure at having the opportunity of paying the debt of charity which he owed the Order and referred to the precedent set in this respect by five of his predecessors whom he specified by name. In accordance with the great hopes he entertained of their good works in behalf of the Church, he benevolently recalled to their minds the marvelous example set them by the saints of their Order, as well as of the saints in general, in the cultivation of humility; with the practice of this virtue he urged them further to join a love of poverty and charity.

His Eminence, Jaime Cardinal de Barros Camara, Archbishop of Rio de Janeiro, was appointed in a letter of our Holy Father dated Oct. 3, 1948,[2] Apostolic Legate to the National Eucharistic Congress held in Portalegre. In the letter, our Holy Father expressed the wish that the theme of the Congress should be the need of society for the Holy Eucharist in the promotion of social justice.

A letter of encouragement, dated Dec. 1, 1947,[3] sent to the German Hierarchy in response to its pledge of loyalty, is also reproduced in the December, 1948, issue of the *Acta*, as well as a letter of congratulation sent, under date of Nov. 15, 1948,[4] to His Eminence, Maurilio Cardinal Fossati, Archbishop of Turin, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination and the twenty-fifth anniversary of his consecration.

Allocutions are also reported given to the Ambassador of Belgium, Alexander Paternotte de La Vaillée, on Dec. 4, 1948,[5] and to the Ambassador of Spain, Ruiz-Giminez Cortés Ioachim, on Dec. 12, 1948.[6] The occasion for these allocutions was the respective presentation of the credentials of these diplomats. Another allocution was delivered to the President of Italy, Luigi Einaudi, on Dec. 15, 1948.[7]

---

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XL (1948), 551.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 547.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 544.

[4] *Ibid.,* p. 549.

[5] *Ibid.,* p. 553.

[6] *Ibid.,* p. 555.

[7] *Ibid.,* p. 557.

By Apostolic Letters of May 15, 1947,[8] inserted in the December issue of the *Acta,* our Holy Father designated the Blessed Virgin "of Graces" (popularly called "Madonna di Montenero") as the Patroness of Tuscany. By three other Apostolic Letters the rank of Minor Basilica was conferred on the following churches: April 7, 1948,[9] St. Margaret's Abbey Church in "Brevnov" near Prague, Czecho-Slovakia; April 21, 1948,[10] the Church of Our Mother of the Abandoned, in Valencia, Spain; and May 2, 1948,[11] the Cathedral of Harlem, the Netherlands.

Changes in the status of ecclesiastical subdivisions in Peru and in missionary lands were made by four Apostolic Constitutions. One, dated May 7, 1948,[12] separated from the Diocese of Chachapoyas, Peru, a portion of its territory and this it established as a Prelacy *nullius* with its seat in the City of Moyobamba. Another, dated May 13, 1948,[13] established a new Vicariate Apostolic, that of Kambala, from territory taken from the Vicariate of the Upper Nile, and it transferred the See of the latter to the City of Tororo. A third, dated June 10, 1948,[14] raised the Prefecture of Ghardaia in the Sahara to the rank of a Vicariate. The fourth, also dated June 10, 1948,[15] conferred the same rank on the Prefecture of Montana in the Philippine Islands.

A decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, dated June 11, 1948,[16] provided that all is in order to permit the canonization of Blessed Vincenza Gerosa, one of the Founders of the Sisters of Charity in the town of Luere of the Diocese of Brescia. Another decree of the same Sacred Congregation, dated July 26, 1948,[17] certified to the practice of virtue in the requisite degree by the Venerable Servant of God, Bartholomew Canale, a priest of the Congregation of the Barnabite Clerks Regular of St. Paul.

There is reported also in this issue of the *Acta* the appointment as Auxiliary of New York of the Most Reverend Joseph F. Flannelly, D.D.[18]

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

---

[8] *Ibid.,* p. 536.

[9] *Ibid.,* p. 538.

[10] *Ibid.,* p. 540.

[11] *Ibid.,* p. 542.

[12] *Ibid.,* p. 529.

[13] *Ibid.,* p. 532.

[14] *Ibid.,* p. 534.

[15] *Ibid.,* p. 535.

[16] *Ibid.,* p. 561.

[17] *Ibid.,* p. 563.

[18] *Ibid.,* p. 559.

Book Reviews

CHURCHES, THEIR PLAN AND FURNISHING. By Peter F. Anson. Re-F. Anson. Revised and edited by Thomas F. Croft-Fraser and H. A. Reinhold. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1948. Pp. xx+242. $6.50.

The volume before us while treating the subjects dealt with in our own Monsignor Collins' *The Church Edifice and its Appointments,* presents so much supplementary matter, especially of an architectural and artistic character, that the author cannot be said to have compiled a book which is merely repetitious of what has already been published. Peter F. Anson, a convert from Anglican monasticism, who also tried his vocation to the religious life under Catholic auspices, brings to his work a life-long interest in the subject of the church and its various furnishings, together with ability to illustrate the text with drawings which greatly enhance both its use and its attraction. His book has been "Americanized" by the Reverend Hans Reinhold, of Sunnyside, Washington, to adapt it for practical use in this country, which has been done with no sacrifice of the engaging features of the original work.

The twenty-two chapters of Anson's book present the legislation of the Church governing buildings dedicated to divine worship and their manifold appurtenances. The altar and its furnishings, the sanctuary and the baptistery, the nave and the sacristy, the organ and the bells, all receive adequate and interesting treatment. Sections also cover the regulations affecting the sacred vessels, the liturgical vestments, and the different ceremonial accessories. A final chapter gives some practical advice on lighting, heating, and ventilation.

The author begins with the fundamental notion that a church is built for the purpose of public worship and hence, whatever its style, the building must fulfill its functional *raison d'être*. Therefore, the church should be evolved in sequence of design from the inside outwards and not from the outside inwards. A series of pictures and ground plans illustrate how this fundamental idea may be realized, whether the church be, in its architecture, early Christian or Gothic, Romanesque or Renaissance, Georgian or modern. He insists, both for the building of new edifices and the restoration of old ones, on Pugin's basic principles that a church have no features which are not necessary for "convenience, construction, or propriety," and that all ornament should consist of "enrichment of the essential construction of the building."

In the matter of altars, we agree, naturally, with the author, that the altar should be the focal-point of the interior of the church but we do not follow him in his approval of Eric Gill's contention that the only logical place for the altar is the centre of the church building (p. 84). In his treatment of vestments, we gain the impression that Peter Anson regards all forms of the chasuble, Roman and Spanish, French and German, medieval and semi-Gothic, as legitimate under present laws, making no reference to the decree of the Sacred Congregation, under date of Dec. 9, 1925, forbidding any departure from the *forma consueta* without consultation with the Holy See. We see merit, on the other hand, in his view that when an existing tabernacle is of such shape or size that it cannot possibly be entirely covered with the required enveloping *conopaeum* nothing is gained by spoiling the architectural design with curtains in front only, as a gesture in the right direction (p. 94).

The entire volume is profusely and artistically illustrated and the text is well provided with authoritative references. An adequate bibliography prefaces the book. All in all, *Churches, Their Plan and Furnishing* will be an important addition to the working library of any priest, especially those in charge of parishes, and can be recommended to architects and builders who specialize in church construction.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

INDEX TO CATHOLIC PAMPHLETS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE (June, 1946-November, 1948). By Eugene Paul Willging. Washington, D. C.: The Compiler, 1948. Pp. 80. $1.25.

This is the third supplement, or fourth volume, of a very useful Catholic reference tool. The present Index, as the title suggests, has enlarged its scope to cover not only American Catholic pamphlets, but also the many outstanding titles from England, Ireland, Canada, and Australia. Historical data on the Catholic Truth Society of London and Dublin and the Catholic Social Guild of Oxford add interest and usefulness, and serve as an introduction to the listing of their publications. A directory of publishers and a calendar of feasts to suggest displays will especially interest pamphlet rack-tenders. Each title is briefly described as to content and scope, carefully classified and indexed.

Sales figures compiled by Mr. Willging, who is the Director of Catholic University Library, indicate a distribution of approxmately thirteen million American Catholic pamphlets annually. There is no longer any question about the value of these little booklets. They are written for the man in the street, they capitalize on a brief attention span, they reach people who would not listen to a sermon or read a book on the subject, they are eye-catching and inexpensive. There is the right pamphlet for the right person. This Index and its predecessors are the keys that unlock a great storehouse of literature in philosophy and psychology, the Bible, the Church and Science, Church History, Canon Law, Eastern Churches, Catholic Action, Dogma, Moral, Christology, Mariology, Apologetics, Liturgy, the Sacraments, Ascetics, the Commandments, Vocations, Education, Biography, Catholic literature and bibliography, and Juveniles. The pastor should have all four volumes of the Index. The third volume has a practical chapter on the pamphlet library and easy methods of cataloging and classifying it. Priests will find in a well organized pamphlet collection a most useful and adaptable assistant—to make the first contact with a prospective convert, to supplement his instruction, to stimulate the lukewarm, to serve as textbooks for study groups, confraternities and convert clubs, to help religion teachers, to arouse and direct vocations, and to answer the many questions that are brought to the rectory door. The Index is a guide both for the selection and the servicing of titles. The cost of the complete set of Indexes is $3.50 plus postage and may be ordered from The Compiler, 513 Webster St., N.W., Washington, D. C.

JAMES J. KORTENDICK, S.S.

ECCE AGNUS DEI. By Eric E. May, O.F.M.Cap. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1947. Pp. xiv+177. $2.00.

The treatise, *Ecce Agnus Dei,* is the product of an exhaustive study made by Dr. Eric May on the Scriptural text: John 1:29, 36, the first part of which is the *Ecce Agnus Dei qui tollit peccatum mundi.* After a preliminary philological analysis of the Greek text, Dr. May examines every known exegetical approach to the text, beginning with the interpretations found in the writings of the Church Fathers and ecclesiastical writers of the first eight centuries. In this regard it might be noted that although he had promised a "fuller treatment" of the writers of the patristic era, he devotes only six paragraphs to these early expounders of the Sacred Text. Somewhat more extensive is his examination of the later writers, viz., the Scholastic, Medieval, Post-Reformation and modern authors.

Dr. May next enumerates the different theories offered to explain what symbolism of the lamb the Baptist had in mind when he first uttered the *Ecce Agnus Dei.* After rejecting as less desirable the Victorious Leader Theory, the Innocence Theory, the Tamid-Sacrifice Theory, and the Paschal Lamb Theory, he proposes as the most probable answer to the problem, the Suffering Servant Theory. This thesis, which the author admits is not original, would explain the symbolism of the lamb in this way: the Baptist was conscious of the Messiahship and divinity of Jesus, and he knew that Christ would die a sacrificial death for the sins of mankind. To inform his listeners of these truths the Baptist used the language of Isaias 53, wherein the sacrificial death of the Suffering Servant, the Lamb of God, was foretold. After bolstering this theory with many solid arguments, Dr. May suggests quite plausible answers to the numerous possible objections to his theory.

In his study Dr. May intended to discuss and to solve two Scriptural problems connected with the "Lamb of God" text: first, the meaning of the expression *Ecce Agnus Dei* in the mouth of St. John the Baptist; and, secondly, the provenience of the symbol of the lamb. That he attained his objective in a most scholarly and convincing fashion is the firm conviction of this reviewer.

THOMAS B. FALLS

THE CANONICAL SEPARATION OF CONSORTS. By the Rev. Eugene A. Forbes, A.B., S.T.L., J.C.D. Ottawa, Ont.: The University of Ottawa Press, 1948. Pp. 286. $4.00.

This work is a dissertation prepared for the Faculty of Ecclesiastical Sciences at the University of Ottawa. It has the usual arrangement of historical introduction and canonical commentary.

The historical introduction to this work begins with an investigation of the idea of separation of consorts in the Old Testament and closes with a review of pertinent legislation and jurisprudence. These are interesting pages and well worth reading. Particularly interesting is the able synopsis of the Roman Law regarding the separation of consorts.

The canonical commentary is a well-balanced analysis and disquisition on the apposite canons of the Code. Any part of this section could be selected for further comment but perhaps the more practical thing would be to mention the author's generous commentary on the responses of the Holy See regarding the separation of consorts, the excellent description of the causes and effects of separation and the subsequent right, real or alleged, of the parties to seek a civil divorce. In connection with the latter item, abundant material is offered for the study of the position of Catholic judges and lawyers in civil divorce suits.

Many points in the canonical commentary are not found in other books treating of the separation of consorts. Other points are elsewhere passed over briefly. This makes the volume of Fr. Forbes of considerable importance in the work of the chancery. Moreover, certain pages of this work where principles and rules are stated should be in the hands of everyone who may have to pass some judgment on the merits of projected separations.

The conclusions of the author are stated as a summary of his dissertation. They are not mentioned in the form of propositions. The author holds that it is safest in practice to deny a separate domicile to a wife who is separated from her husband legitimately but without the authority of the Ordinary. This opinion is not held by all canonists.

A useful appendix is offered by the author. This is a synopsis of the civil laws of the several States regarding the separation of consorts. This utility would have been increased had the author printed these laws in English rather than, as he admits, copied them from a Latin work. The bibliography is satisfactory but, unfortunately, there is no index. Some typographical errors which are found even in the headings of sections should be corrected in future editions. All in all this work is worth purchasing and will repay reading and study.

EDWARD ROELKER

QUAESTIONES SELECTAE EX HISTORIA PRIMAEVA. 2nd ed. By F. Cueppens, O.P. Turin: Marietti, 1948. Pp. xxiv+376.

This is a valuable compilation of studies, facts, opinions, and references bearing on the Biblical narratives of Creation (Gen. 1:1-2, 4a), Paradise and the Fall (Gen. 2:4b-3, 24), the Deluge (Gen. 6:1-9, 17), and the Tower of Babel (Gen. 11:1-9). In its revised form (first edition, 1934) it appears at a time when many Catholic scripturists are writing on these topics.

While no one treatise opens in respect to these matters all the vistas that could be desired, Fr. Cueppens does present sound judgments on those points where a sure judgment is possible, and presents more fully and with better documentation than any current Catholic writer the state of the question in matters where exegetes, or scientists, or both, are still groping. The four topics are treated at unequal length: Creation, pp. 3-84; Paradise and the Fall, pp. 85-241; the Deluge, pp. 242-338; and the Tower of Babel, pp. 339-359. The last of these may perhaps be adjudged too short; though it does have the merit of taking into account J. Chaine's study in the *Mélanges Podechard,* published as recently as 1945.

The war has something to do, no doubt, with the unevenness of the bibliography. However, Americans in particular have no special reason to be gratified. The names of Frs. McClellan, S.J., and Coleran, S.J., and that of Prof. R. Gordis, are misspelled. Fr. Edw. F. Siegman's useful article in *Cath. Bibl. Quart.,* V (1943), 318-31, on "Genesis 1-11 in the Seminary Scripture Course," is not listed. Fr. Donat Poulet is represented by articles from the Ottawa University review; his book, *Tous les hommes, sont-ils fils de Noe?* is not cited. On p. 336, Sir

Leonard Woolley, who excavated for the British Museum before the first World War, becomes *Americanus quidam,* in connection with the work of Ur. Perhaps because he was *so* wrong about the Flood?

PATRICK W. SKEHAN

THE PRIEST AND THE PROLETARIAT. By Robert Kothen. Translated from the French by Frank Maher. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1948. Pp. v+64. $1.50.

Probably most readers of the *Review* have heard of the priest-workmen of France who were deported for forced labor during the War or who took jobs in factories afterwards. Those who want more information on the subject and can spare only a couple of hours for the purpose would do well to read this little book. For the most part it consists of quotations from the publications of the priest-workmen themselves with introductions and connecting passages by the author. Both the underlying theory and the practical operation of the movement are covered and the *Declaration of the Assembly of the Cardinals and Archbishops of France* on the subject is added to express the official viewpoint. All in all the book is as satisfactory an introduction as one could expect to find in such a slender volume.

In France the gap between the priest and the proletariat is admittedly wide. The priest-workmen feel that the best way to bridge this gap is to discard the soutane and to become, as far as possible, members of the working class. They take jobs in factories, live in proletarian districts, and celebrate Mass in their own homes or elsewhere outside the church. They mingle with the other workers on more or less equal terms and are addressed by their first names without the usual titles of respect. After a year or two in a factory the priest-workman may give up his job so that he can devote full time to priestly work but otherwise continue the same manner of life or he may return to more conventional forms of sacerdotal activity with a better knowledge of the worker's problems. The participants in this movement feel very strongly that the priest can reach workingmen with maximum efficiency only when he knows their life, so to speak, from the inside.

The declaration of the French cardinals and archbishops gives a balanced judgment on the movement. Factory work certainly cannot be considered a necessary or usual means of evangelizing the proletariat. "The majority of working men do not want the priest to become a worker." At the same time "in certain well-defined circumstances" priests "who possess a striking combination of qualities and virtues" may be permitted to become priest-workmen, but such permission must always be regarded as exceptional. To the American priest the movement is at least suggestive and it will be watched with great interest.

PAUL HANLY FURFEY

MASS SYMBOLS. Sixteen Cards, wall-size. By Joachim Watrin, O.S.B. Explanatory booklet by Rev. Godfrey Diekmann, O.S.B. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1947. Set $2.60; booklet 40 cents.

These sixteen bold symbolic illustrations, silk-screened in black and red on heavy whtie cards (11x14 inches), might well be entitled "How the Priests' Hands Pray," or "What the Priest's Hands Say." Even without the accompanying booklet, which reproduces the illustrations in black and red, and comments on them by Godfrey Diekmann, the well-known editor of *Orate Fratres,* these wall-cards are ideally suited to disclose what rich depths of worship are latent in the manual acts of the celebrant at Mass.

The series includes: *Introibo, Mea culpa, Oremus* (Collect), Gospel, Accept This Spotless Host, Sharers (in His Divinity), *Lavabo, Sursum corda, Memento, Hanc igitur,* Giving Thanks He Blessed It, Elevation, All Honor and Glory, Breaking of Bread, Communion, Blessing. Pastors will want these for their schools.

GERALD ELLARD, S.J.

Q. SEPTIMIUS FLORENS TERTULLIANUS, DE ORATIONE. Critische Uitgabe met Prolegomena, Vertaling en Philologisch-Exegetisch-Liturgische Commentar door G. F. Diercks. Bussum: Uitgeverij Paul Brand, 1947.

This is an excellent scientific study of Tertullian's treatise on Prayer presented to the faculty of the University of Amsterdam in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Letters. The Prolegomena contain the following topics: a carefully weighed appraisal of the manuscript evidence, a discussion of previous editions and translations with a justification of the author's edition and version, a table exhibiting the form in which the Lord's Prayer is found in various textual witnesses, and inquiry into the reason why Tertullian placed the third petition of the Our Father before the second, an investigation of the sources, date, influence, and original form of Tertullian's discourses on the Lord's Prayer.

These Prolegomena, which are written with consummate rigor and erudition, are followed by the text and translation of Tertullian's treatise on opposite pages. The author then gives us a detailed commentary on the treatise in which all the philological, exegetical, and liturgical problems arising from the text are discussed. A comprehensive bibliography and an index of Latin words and other important terms discussed in the book complete this model specimen of a scientific edition of a patristic work. The author has performed his task with such thoroughness and learning that no student of Tertullian can afford to be without this book.

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

NORMAE GENERALES JURIS CANONICI. By Dr. Gommarus Michiels, O.F. Min. Cap. Editio altera penitus retractata et notabiliter aucta. Paris-Turin-Rome: Desclée, 1949. Vol. I, pp. 705; Vol. II, pp. 783.

An important commentary on the first book of the Code of Canon Law has been re-edited. The title-page says this work has been entirely rewritten and notably enlarged. This is a true statement. Almost every section has been enriched with new material which is the result of a close and careful study of commentaries, dissertations, articles, etc. that have appeared in several languages since the first edition of *Normae generales* in 1929.

The reading of just a few sections of this work is enough to convince one of the comparative necessity of having the new edition. For scholars, teachers, and all those who seek even more material for a better understanding of the first book of the Code, the footnotes of the new edition are abundant and excellent sources. The author does not merely exhibit his erudition. The annotations indicate sources of doctrine and opinion. Michiels frequently disagrees with even the best commentators but he discusses their views fairly and shows where these opinions may be found.

It is obvious in a work of this size that some parts must reluctantly be set aside for a mention of other points. Space does not permit a really adequate review of this work. Those who know the first edition can readily see that some selection must be made.

The opinions of Michiels are always worthy of consideration. While disagreement exists between the author and other commentators, including the reviewer, no one presumes to underrate the author's views.

Some of the controversial points of law discussed by Michiels follow. The author holds that non-Catholic communities cannot bring a custom contrary to the law into legal force. Michiels, however, supports his contention by the principle set down in canon 87 where a barrier to the exercise of rights is stated. Michiels also maintains that a parish is a unit sufficiently capable of introducing a custom.

Michiels holds that common precepts as distinguished from law do not